

PUBLISHER'S NOTE

The students find it difficult to prèpare the History of Europe for the University examinations as they very often cannot frame questions for themselves, and when asked questions they do not know what should be the exact answers. With a view to help them the University Questions of ten years have been systematically arranged, and the answers have been written out by an experienced Professor. These questions cover the period from 1815 to 1919. We hope this little book will be found useful by those for whom it is meant.

A HISTORY OF EUROPE

CONTENTS

	PAGE.
Influence of Napoleon	... 1
Europe on the Fall of Napoleon	.. 3
The Congress of Vienna	7
Other questions on the Congress of Vienna	... 10
Europe in 1815 to 1914	... 12
Reaction in Italy and Spain	.. 14
The Restoration	... 17
The Holy Alliance	.. 19
Concert of Europe	.. 20
Foreign Policies of Castlereagh and Canning	... 22
Canning's Policy	.. 24
Character and Policy of Mettermich	... 26
Reactionary and Liberal Policy	... 28
Greek War of Independence	.. 30
Fall of the Bourbons	.. 33
Effects of the July Revolution	. 36
War of the Belgian Independence	... 38
Orleanist Monarchy	... 39
February Revolution	... 42
The Austro-Prussian War	... 67
The Battle of Sadowa	... 69
Franco-Prussian War	... 71
Unification of Germany	... 72
Influence of Bismarck upon European Affairs	... 77
Growth of Prussia	... 77

Fall of the Second French Empire and Napoleon III	... 81
Origin of the Second Empire	... 81
Causes of the Fall of Napoleon III	... 84
The Third Republic	... 84
Turkey in Europe	... 87
Russo-Turkish War	... 90
The Treaty of Berlin	... 95
Break-up of the Ottoman Empire	... 97
Foreign Policy of Bismarck	... 98
Bismarck and Disraeli	... 100
Colonial Development of Germany	... 102
Expansion of Europe	... 104
French Colonial Empire	... 106
Russian Reforms	... 108
Nihilism	111
Spain	113
Switzerland, History of Switzerland during the Nineteenth Century	... 116
The Papacy	... 118
Rise of Japan	... 120
Russo-Japanese War	123
The Causes of the War	123
Chief Events of the War	... 124
Results of the War	... 125
Political Effects of the War	... 125
Gladstone's Irish Policy	... 126
Main Features of the Nineteenth Century	... 129
Effects of the Industrial Revolution	... 132
New Political Theories	... 134
Influence of other countries upon Europe	... 137

New Political Theories of the Twentieth Century	139
Germany a Menace to Europe	143
Conflict of Germany and Great Britain	... 146
The Great War	... 148
Russian Revolution	154
New Egypt	157
Nation	159
Poland	. 161

Short Notes on :—

Reform Bill of 1832	163
The Greek Revolt of 1828	165
Kossuth (1802-94)	165
The Hague Convention	167
Louis Blanc	. 168
The Alabama Incident	.. 169
The Dreyfus Case	... 170
Chartism	.. 171
Metternich's System	... 172
The Schleswig-Holstein Question	.. 173
Hetaireia Philike	.. 173
Kultur Kampf	... 174
Napoleonic Idea	... 176
Zollverein	.. 176
Young Ireland	... 177
Maps	.. 178

A HISTORY OF EUROPE

INFLUENCE OF NAPOLEON

Q. 1. Explain how the conquest and policy of Napoleon I influenced the course of European history during the nineteenth century. (P U. 1931)

Napoleon had conquered all the countries in the neighbourhood of France, *viz.*, Italy, Switzerland, the Rhine Provinces, Holland, the German States, Spain and had forced Prussia, Austria and Russia to enter into alliance with him. His ambition was to complete the work of the French Revolution. He fought with the Powers hostile to the French ambitions. The monarchical States at the instigation of the discontented emigres had taken up arms against France. They were afraid of the spread of the democratic ideas of France, and were anxious for the maintenance of their old feudal system. The attitude of these States stirred the national feelings of the French. They successfully drove the opponents of the Revolution from their borders, and then felt that unless their ideas of democracy were accepted in other lands, their reforms would be in danger. Napoleon rose into prominence in the war with Austria in Italy. Since his return from Egypt he wanted to consolidate the French system by keeping the men engaged in war with the monarchical States. He won brilliant victories against Austria, and made the European monarchs acknowledge his supremacy. He extended the French Empire from Lubeck to the Ebro, and from Brest to Rome. The conquered provinces welcomed the French rule as Napoleon abolished some of the evil practices of the ancient regime. The feudal system was crushed and people were granted the protection of law according to the Code of Napoleon. He introduced several reforms in France, and the countries falling under his influence benefitted by similar measures. The oppressed nationalities of Germany, and Poland looked up to him as their liberator. Italy which consisted of a large number of small States was divided into three big parts. Some parts

were annexed to France, the northern provinces were created into the Kingdom of Italy and the southern part was made the Kingdom of Naples.

He had also destroyed the old Holy Roman Empire, and had formed out of the large number of feudal principalities the Confederation of the Rhin consisting of thirty-two provinces including four kingdoms, five grand-duchies, and thirty-three principalities. He had humiliated Austria at the battle of Austerlitz, and Prussia at Jena. He also forced Austria, Prussia and Russia to submit to the continental system which aimed at the destruction of the English trade with Europe. By his conquests he had stimulated the national sentiment in Italy and Germany. But his attempt to conquer Spain roused up the feelings of the Spaniards who had no sympathy with the ideals of the French Revolution. The Spanish national movement was the direct result of the policy of conquest. The next country to organise its national forces was Prussia. The birth of nationalism in Europe was the outcome of the policy of Napoleon in extending his influence all over Europe. The forces of nationalism worked throughout the nineteenth century. They worked strongly in Italy, Germany, Greece and the Balkan States, Belgium, Poland, Hungary and Bohemia. In fact the history of Europe during the nineteenth century consists of a series of wars and revolutions for the establishment of States on national lines.

His civil reforms have practically been enforced in all the European countries. The position of serfs and peasants has been improved. The feudal system and the old hereditary aristocracy enjoying all the privileges in Church and State have been replaced by a new order of men promoted according to merit, and a new state of society in which every citizen is considered equal to any other before the eyes of law. By his system of education Napoleon laid the foundation of the new movement of emancipation. Metternich and the reactionary rulers tried for sometime to crush the movement for intellectual freedom. But the history of the century is a triumph of the policy of Napoleon. Universities have been established,

and education has been made compulsory. The next thing which Napoleon attempted, in the spirit of the Revolution, was the adjustment of the relations between the Church and the State. As he abolished the Holy Roman Empire, so he reduced the temporal authority of the Pope. The State should not be placed under the authority of the Church, he did not accept his Crown from the hands of the Pope. The work of emancipation of the State from the control of the Church proceeded in the nineteenth century. An echo of this movement is heard in the Kultur Kampf of Germany.

Napoleon blundered in his economic policy of continental system. It is on account of the pressure he put upon the other countries that he created enemies amongst those who acknowledged him as their ally. He starved the European countries by depriving them of their free right of trade. Russia was the first to rebel, and Napoleon was ruined in his attempt to punish that country. The European States formed a new combination to reduce his authority. They brought about his overthrow and continued to watch the affairs of France for sometime to come. The Concert of Europe was the direct result of Napoleon's economic policy and his device to dominate Europe. The history of Europe till 1848 was influenced by the spirit to crush the democratic sentiments of the French Revolution, and to frustrate the efforts of Napoleon and his family to come back to power. But the reactionary measures were swept away before the strong tide of nationalism which was inspired by Napoleon's policy.

EUROPE ON THE FALL OF NAPOLEON

Q. 2 Describe the condition of Western Europe during the period immediately following the fall of Napoleon (1815—22).
(P. U 1926).

On the fall of Napoleon the big Powers assembled at Vienna to settle the problems of the countries conquered and dominated by Napoleon, and to devise means of controlling the French influence and of making it impossible for Napoleon and his family to come back to power.

The monarchical States which had combined to bring about the overthrow of Napoleon formed the Concert of Europe with the object of crushing revolutions or liberal movements in any part of Europe. In the settlement at Vienna they ignored the principle of nationality, and adopted the doctrine of legitimacy. They were not true to their declared policy in all cases. Some of the old rulers were not restored because of their sympathies with Napoleon. The policy of the Powers was guided by Metternich, the Prime Minister of Austria. He was a conservative statesman, and did not believe in constitutionalism or democracy. The restored monarchs returned to old methods of Government, in some places feudalism was re-established, and a strong wave of reaction set in in almost every country. The Bourbon king of France had no doubt agreed to a new constitution, but the return of the nobility and the discontented emigres created a new situation. The Ultra-Royalists wanted to restore all the institutions of the ancient regime. They restricted the liberty of the press, proposed to restore the confiscated lands to the Church, and to reduce the number of voters by raising the qualifications. In Spain the restoration meant the re-establishment of the inquisition and the other evil practices. All the works of reforms introduced by Napoleon in Italy were removed, including the street lamps.

Belgium had been added to Holland, although there was nothing in common between them. The German nationalists were denied the privilege of closer association which they so keenly desired. There was discontent almost in every country. The Belgians were sick of their union with the Dutch and desired separation. The Italians wanted unity, freedom from the control of the Austrians and constitutional government. The Germans were anxious for constitutional reforms and national unity. The Spaniards set up a movement for reforms on the lines of the constitution of 1812. Everywhere the Governments adopted a strict policy of repression. The French frontiers had been under the military occupation of the Powers till the indemnity was paid.

stitution in March, 1820, and so did King Frederick I of Naples in July next. The success of these revolutions upset the policy of Metternich and he called a conference of the Powers at Troppau in October. There was difference of opinion about the measures they would adopt. Austria, Prussia and Russia were in favour of intervention, England and France considered these revolutions as domestic concerns and did not support international intervention. But the three other Powers were bent upon crushing these revolutions. At the next Conference at Laibach King Frederick of Naples was summoned to present his case, and he was given the aid of an Austrian army to suppress the revolt. The nationalists in Italy were defeated by the Austrians at the battle of Novara. The people of Piedmont and Lombardy who had sympathised with the Neapolitans were very severely dealt with. The failure of the nationalist movement in Italy was a rude shock to the liberals. It was decided at the Congress of Verona that instead of general intervention in Spain, France alone would be allowed to deal with the situation. In pursuance of this policy the French troops helped to restore King Ferdinand to power. In this way the Powers of Europe coerced the smaller nations on the fall of Napoleon. In fact they took the place of Napoleon in controlling the affairs of Europe. They did nothing to restore the economic equilibrium or to bring about a reconciliation between the different classes. Their main method was repression and intervention. The period was marked by a struggle between the forces of liberalism and the policy of repression. The system of international government by Congresses became gradually discredited on account of the British minister Canning. These periodic reunions were organised for the purpose of suppressing the liberties of the peoples. The Congress system developed into a machinery for oppression. It was denounced by Canning, and finally given up.

THE CONGRESS OF VIENNA

Q. 3. What questions were chiefly in dispute at the Congress of Vienna, and on what principles was the map of Europe rearranged? (P. U. 1916)

The Congress of the Powers which met at Vienna on the fall of Napoleon in 1814 had first of all to ratify the proposals already agreed upon at Paris. The four allied Powers had come to an understanding regarding Italy, Belgium, and the left bank of the Rhine before they left France. There were also a number of treaties in existence between the different Powers which the Congress would not like to modify. By the treaty of Paris May 30, 1814, the frontiers of France were fixed as those in existence on the 1st January, 1792. Besides she was not to pay indemnity nor to return the art treasures which Napoleon had carried away from the different countries. She had however to recognise the independence of the Netherlands, Switzerland, the German and Italian States lately dominated by Napoleon. By separate treaties Norway had been promised to Sweden: Prussia, Russia and Austria had come to an agreement regarding the partition of Poland between themselves; Austria would obtain Lombardy and Venetia, and Belgium should be added to Holland. the King of Bavaria was assured of the full sovereign rights

The problem of Poland was very thorny. The Poles asked Napoleon to reorganise their ancient Kingdom. But Napoleon to humour Austria and Prussia did not help the Poles. The Tsar of Russia had however promised to restore an independent Kingdom of Poland connected by personal union with the Crown of Russia. Prussia had agreed to surrender her claims to Poland as she expected that Russia would support her in obtaining Saxony. Austria on the other hand did not like the growth in territories of either Prussia or Russia. England also thought that this would upset the Balance of Power, so the question of Poland and Saxony agitated the minds of the diplomats for sometime. Russia was insistent upon having Poland and finally Poland was

partitioned between the three countries, Prussia obtained Thorn and Danzig with the Province of Posen, Austria got back Galicia, Cracow was created a Republic under guarantee of the three Eastern Powers, while the rest of the Grand Duchy of Warsaw was constituted as the "Congress Kingdom of Poland" with the Tsar of Russia as the King of Poland. When the question of Poland was decided, the Powers had to think of compensation to Prussia, the problems of Saxony, Alsace-Lorraine, the future of Germany, the relative position of Prussia and Austria, the position of the minor States, and similar other questions. There was likely to be a split between the Powers over these questions, Russia and Prussia forming one group and Austria and England the other. The differences were acute and another European war was apprehended. At this stage Napoleon returned from Elba and the Powers in face of this great danger settled their differences. They signed the Final Act of the Congress on June 9.

The main problem before the Congress was the reconstruction of the map of Europe, and to arrange about the future Government of the Provinces held by Napoleon. When they were looking out for a formula which should guide them in their work of settlement M. Talleyrand of France suggested the principle of "legitimacy" *i.e.*, the old legitimate ruler of the States should be restored to their thrones. This was accepted in main and applied in most cases, except in the case of the Republic of Italy, a few German States, Norway, Sweden and Belgium. But in their work of settlement the Powers were guided by self-interest. They had to maintain the Balance of Power and had to see that each Great Power regained the territories which it held in 1805, or its equivalent, whatever a Power lost in one part it obtained compensation for it in another part.

In rearranging the map of Europe the principles of "legitimacy" and the "Balance of Power" were mainly adopted. The legitimate rulers of France, Spain, the

Italian and German States were restored. The principle of Balance of Power was observed almost in all cases except in the expansion of Russia which obtained the Congress Kingdom of Poland with Warsaw as Capital, Finland, and Bessarabia. In the opinion of the diplomats of England and Austria this increase in territory was likely to upset the balance.

Prussia did not get as much as she had in 1805, but in exchange for the possessions in Poland she obtained half of Saxony, and the Rhine Province which were German Provinces. By this exchange she became a great German Power. Austria lost some territories in the Netherlands and Germany, but she was compensated in Italy by Lombardy and Venetia. She thus not only remained the most important State in Germany but controlled the affairs of Italy. The Kingdom of Saxony was reduced, Bavaria was created an independent State and the smaller States of Germany were rearranged to suit the convenience of Austria and Prussia. Germany was created a Federation of thirty-nine States with Austria at the head.

Italy was reduced once again to a "geographical expression." Venetia and Lombardy were allotted to Austria; Genoa was given to the King of Piedmont, the Papal States, Naples, and a few more smaller States were restored.

Switzerland, Spain, and Portugal regained their old boundaries. Belgium was added to Holland to form the United Kingdom of the Netherlands with a view to strengthen the smaller States against France. Sweden was given Norway to fulfil the pledge given to her when she joined the combination against Napoleon. The principle of nationality which the peoples of all the countries began to cherish was absolutely disregarded in the settlements. Thus Italy was dismembered, Belgium was forcibly added to Holland, and the German unity was not accomplished. Poland and Finland remained in foreign hands.

OTHER QUESTIONS ON THE CONGRESS OF VIENNA

Q. 4. Enumerate the main tasks which lay before the Congress of Vienna, 1815. Estimate the wisdom of the Vienna arrangements both in the light of contemporary history and subsequent events. (P. U. 1921).

The main tasks before the Congress were: (1) to see that France could not again start a war of aggression; (2) to settle the affairs of the countries given up by France; and (3) to establish an equilibrium of the forces working in Europe.

In France the Bourbon Dynasty was restored, the boundaries were pushed back to those as existed in 1792, and Napoleon was first exiled to Elba. After Waterloo an indemnity was imposed, France had to disgorge the art treasures carried away by Napoleon, and Napoleon was deported to St. Helena, and the members of his family were driven away from France. The first task was in this way accomplished.

The countries given up by France were dealt with according to the interests of the Big Powers. Russia, Prussia, Austria and England each wanted to expand at the expense of the territories released from the French control. The deliberations were checked at times by the principle of the Balance of Power, and the claims of the "legitimate" monarchs. They were however determined not to allow the forces of democracy and freedom to grow, which they considered as the unsettling factors. The absolute Governments were strengthened, and the restored monarchs followed the absolutistic principle of Metternich. That the peace of Europe could be preserved only by the rigid rule of strong monarchs was the opinion of the Austrian minister. The smaller States were not given any opportunity of determining the affairs of Europe.

Russia obtained the greater portion of Poland, Finland and Bessarabia; Prussia got part of Poland, part of Saxony, and the Rhine Province. Austria now had her dominions consolidated at the expense of Italy, some German States, and Poland; England got Hanover expanded, and was

confirmed in her conquests overseas, *i.e.*, Malta, the Ionian Islands, Heligoland in Europe, the Cape in South Africa, the Isles of France, Ceylon and Tobago and St. Lucia in the West Indies.

To strengthen the smaller States in mid-Europe Belgium was added to Holland and the small German States were consolidated into a Confederation of 39 States under the Presidency of Austria. Italy was divided into a number of small States, *i.e.*, Lombardy and Venetia under Austria, the Kingdom of Sardinia was consolidated by joining Savoy and Geneva, the Duchies of Parma, Modena and Tuscany were restored, the Papal State was reorganised, and Naples and Sicily were placed under the Bourbon monarch Ferdinand I. The Bourbon dynasty was also re-established in Spain. Norway was taken away from Denmark and given to Sweden in reward of the defection of its King Bernadotte from Napoleon. The legitimate ruler of Sweden, Gustavus IV was not restored to power.

Wisdom of the arrangements.—The arrangements were made with a view to promote peace in Europe. The statesmen who finally determined the policy had a dread of the democratic movements, and national sentiments. They failed to appreciate the dynamic forces of democracy and nationalism which were fervently held by the peoples. They made the territorial redistribution without consulting the sentiments of the Peoples concerned. The partition of Poland, division of Italy into a number of small States, separation of Norway from Denmark, the union of Belgium with Holland, the division of Saxony or the failure to give a shape to the German Unity rankled in the hearts of the people. Russia and Austria were allowed to encroach upon other peoples' territories. The Poles, Italians and Belgians were discontented, and Germans fretted their lot. The policy of absolute government did not appeal to the peoples in the restored monarchies. Within a short time the Powers had to deal with a number of revolutions which they managed to crush by intervention, *e. g.*, in Germany, Italy and Spain. But their arrangements did not last more than 15 years. France overthrew the Bourbon rule in 1830,

Belgium revolted the same year, and her independence had to be acknowledged by the Powers, the Italian Unity was attained through a series of wars and revolutions, Germany united under the leadership of Prussia, finally during the Franco-Prussian war in 1870-71. The nationalistic problems still unsolved were determined by the late Great European War (1914-18). The absolute Governments in Europe have been completely smashed, and constitutional Governments have been set up on thoroughly democratic lines. The European diplomats succeeded in only one thing, *viz.*, to pull down Napoleon from power. In other things they proved a failure.

Q. 5 What were the main decisions of the Congress of Vienna? How far did it give effect to the principle of legitimacy? (P. U. 1925)

The main decisions of the Congress have been noted above (Question No 3)

The principle of "legitimacy" was given effect to in France, Spain and Holland. It was not enforced in the case of the republics of Venice and Genoa or some of the States of Germany which were considered weak. Belgium was not restored to its legitimate ruler nor was Sweden. The principle was generally adopted in other cases.

EUROPE IN 1815 TO 1914

Q. 6. Describe the main features of Europe as settled by the Treaty of Vienna, 1815, and compare them with those prevailing in 1914. (P. U. 1930).

Europe as settled by the Treaty of Vienna consisted of the big Empires of Russia and Austria, the German Confederation consisting of 39 States, Norway and Sweden, Denmark, the United Kingdom of Holland and Belgium, France, Spain, Portugal, Switzerland, and the congeries of States in Italy, *viz.*, Austrian Provinces of Lombardy-Venetia, the Kingdom of Sardinia including Piedmont, Savoy and Genoa, the Duchies of Modena, Parma and Tuscany, the Papal States and the Kingdom of Naples and Sicily, to the east the vast Ottoman Empire untouched

A great change has taken place in course of one hundred years, Europe in the twentieth century is a thoroughly democratised Europe, and almost every State has a constitution and Parliament. After the Vienna Settlement Metternich was afraid of constitutions and Parliaments. He tried to maintain the feudal system, and in the Catholic States the authority of the Pope was restored. Pope today has no temporal power. All the States have been thoroughly industrialised, national education has made great progress, and people are fully conscious of their own rights. In 1815 only England and partly France was industrialised. Other countries were in the mediæval stage, and so autocratic rule could continue for some years. The Allies of 1815 have gone into opposite camps, England, Russia and Austria co-operated in fighting against Napoleon. In 1914 England and Russia along with France went against Austria and Germany. There has been a complete reshuffling of parties. The Moslem Turkey which was ignored in 1815 has also joined the Christian Powers of Europe. The storm centre has shifted from France to the Near East, and the rivalry of the Powers in the political and economic spheres brought about the conflagration.

The principle of nationalism was ignored in the settlement of 1815, some of the problems had been solved during the century, but unsolved problems were at the root of the evil. Every submerged national unit was anxious to assist itself, and to obtain its freedom. The Powers instead of crushing this spirit made this the chief cause of their coming to war.

REACTION IN ITALY AND SPAIN

Q. 7 Describe the wave of reaction which followed the Congress of Vienna in Italy and Spain. (*P. U. 1928.*)

Napoleon had awakened in the hearts of the people of Italy the spirit of unity and nationality. He reduced the political divisions of Italy from a dozen to three. He brushed aside local and municipal jealousies and introduced uniform laws and the same method of

Ferdinand I of Naples had promised on his restoration to grant a constitution to his Kingdom on the lines of the constitution drawn up by Lord William Bentinck for Sicily in 1812. But he withdrew from that promise in 1816 at the instance of Metternich. On the outbreak of a revolution in Spain in 1820 King Ferdinand took a solemn oath to maintain the new constitution which the people demanded. But in violation of his pledge he sought the protection of the Powers assembled at Troppau. With the help of Austria and Russia the Neapolitan constitution was torn into pieces, revolution crushed and absolute rule re-established. A similar rising took place in 1821 in Piedmont, when King Victor Emmanuel proved to be a weak king, who had not the ability to crush the revolution nor the courage to defy the Big European Powers. An attempt was made by the Piedmontese and the Lombards to attack the Austrian troops in the rear when they were marching upon Naples. But the movement failed as the Austrians inflicted a heavy defeat upon the insurgents at Novara. To save himself from an awkward situation Victor Emmanuel resigned in favour of his brother Charles Felix. The new ruler was an absolutist and greatly under the influence of Austria and Russia. The liberal movement collapsed in Piedmont, Lombardy and Naples. Austria increased the repression in Lombardy, the revolutionary leaders were thrown in Austrian dungeons, young men were conscripted for the Austrian armies, and all liberal movements were carefully watched. For nearly ten years the policy of reaction reigned supreme in Italy.

The reaction in Spain was more violent than in any other part of Europe. The Bourbon King Ferdinand VII who was restored to power was a miserable compound of 'bigotry, seigniorism, superstition and cruelty.' He had been imprisoned by Napoleon in 1808, and he was hated by the people for his incompetence. On restoration he revoked the constitution which was drawn up on the French model in 1812. The Cortes was dissolved, and old institutions re-established. The Jesuits were recalled, the cruel method of Inquisition revived, the nobility were granted all their

old privileges, the Press was gagged, and the liberals and supporters of Joseph Bonaparte were mercilessly treated. The wave of reaction was so strong that even the Spaniards who welcomed the restoration of the Bourbon rule felt bitterly the new state of things. Secret Societies were formed almost in every Province. Ferdinand was an inefficient ruler. The soldiers joined these secret societies in large numbers as their salaries were in arrears. Military risings took place almost every year from 1814 to 1819. In 1820 risings took place at Cadiz, Corunna, Barcelona and other places. Ferdinand now made an abject surrender and agreed to abide by the decision of the Cortes to adopt the constitution of 1812. A number of reforms were introduced. The revolutionary contagion spread to Portugal and Italy. The Powers then met in conference as they did not think it proper that any country should develop itself as an isolated unit. Their intervention policy crushed the revolution in Italy, and with the support of the Powers France suppressed the rising in Spain and restored the absolute authority of Ferdinand. The insurgent liberals were shot down or hunted out of the country.

THE RESTORATION.

Q. 8. The period 1815-48 in European history has been called "the Restoration and the thirty years' peace". Consider the propriety of these labels. *(P. U. 1917.)*

The period 1815-48 in European history has fitly been called the "Restoration". The monarchs of so many States, who lost their thrones during the French Revolution and the Napoleonic regime were restored to power. France became a monarchy from 1815 to 1830 under the restored Bourbons, and from 1830 to 1848 under Louis Philippe of the Orleanist family. The Bourbon dynasties were also restored in Spain and Naples, the House of Orange in Holland, the Hapsburg princes in Northern Italy, and the Pope in Rome and Central Italy. The smaller Princes in Germany were also reinstated. With the return of the deposed Princes to power some of the practices connected with the Ancient Regime were reintroduced. In Spain and

Italy the authority of the Church was re-established, the Inquisition revived, the feudal system and the supremacy of the privileged classes restored. In France the emigres were allowed to return, the rights of the people were restricted, and with the coming of Charles X to power everything connected with the old system was re-introduced. In Austria feudalism had hardly been abolished, and it was preserved with all its ugly features. Prussia and the German States had to follow in the footsteps of Austria. It was therefore a period of restoration.

Between 1815 and 1848, there was no big European war. The revolutions in Spain, Italy, France, Belgium, Poland or Germany were mainly local in character. Although the Powers had to meet several times to watch the situation they were not involved in any great war. They did not take part in the Greek War of Independence. In this state of comparative peace every country managed to develop its own scheme of economic and social reconstruction. The revolutionary forces were kept strictly under control. The Metternich system worked admirably for some years. France succeeded in paying off her indemnity quickly, and regained her economic prosperity. The Austrian rule in Italy although very irksome produced both peace and prosperity. Germany under the leadership of Prussia organised the marvellous Customs Union (*zollverein*) which facilitated the transport of commodities from one part to another, and greatly helped the States in financial matters. In every country art and literature sufficiently flourished. Taking these into consideration the period may be called the period of peace.

But underneath the smooth surface there was growing a strong under-current of discontent. The spirit of nationalism and democracy could not be so easily suppressed. It produced the great upheaval of 1848. The peace was not broadbased on the good-will of the people. It was imposed upon them by the iron hand of the autocrats.

THE HOLY ALLIANCE.

Q. 9 What were the original aims of the Holy Alliance, and what were its subsequent developments? (*P. U. 1926.*)

Q. 10. Give an account of the formation of the Holy Alliance, trace its development and state on what occasions it interfered with the affairs of the European States. (*P. U. 1917*)

The original aim of the Holy Alliance was to assure peace in Europe. The great sacrifices of the Napoleonic war chastened the rulers, and Tsar Alexander of Russia under the influence of the German mystic Baroness von Krudener enunciated the doctrine that peace could be preserved if the principles of the Christian religion were adhered to by the Governments. The Tsar of Russia, the Emperor of Austria and the King of Prussia signed the famous compact in which they proclaimed that in the administration of their respective States and in their relations with other powers they would be guided by the cardinal precepts of Christianity, *viz.*, Justice, Charity and Peace. In conformity with these principles they promised to lend each other aid and assistance. Further they would consider themselves as members of one and the same Christian nation.

Besides the three original signatories the Kings of France, the Netherlands, Wurtemberg and Saxony subsequently joined the alliance, as did the Governments of Switzerland and Hansa towns. England was then ruled by the Prince Regent, she was therefore not fit constitutionally to sign the document. But all the Christian Powers expressed their sympathy with the objects of the Alliance.

People considered this Alliance as a method of perpetrating tyranny or a combination of monarchs to crush popular movements. They, however, mixed up the Quadruple Alliance with the Holy Alliance which in its inception represented a noble ideal. But no Government meant to practise the principles. The Austrian Minister Metternich ridiculed it as a "sonorous nothing" though he subsequently made use of it to promote his reactionary objects. The English Foreign Minister Castlereagh called

it a "sublime piece of mysticism and nonsense." He believed that the Tsar indulged in these pious movements possibly because he could not maintain the balance of his mind. But Canning suspected the sincerity of the Tsar when he found that Metternich had perverted it to reactionary ends. In the management of the affairs of the State nobody guided his conduct by these Christian virtues as Castlereagh frankly stated: "The benign privileges of the Alliance of the 26th of September, 1815, may be considered as constituting the European system in the matter of political conscience. It would, however, be derogatory to the solemn acts of the sovereigns to mix its discussion with the ordinary diplomatic obligations which bind State to State and which are to be looked for alone in the treaties which have been concluded in the accustomed form."

The Holy Alliance lost sight of the Christian virtues, and was utilised as an alliance of Powers to encourage the revolutionary doctrines. In fact people forgot it after the death of Tsar Alexander in 1825. The most active thing was the Quadruple Alliance.

CONCERT OF EUROPE.

Q 11. What were the causes of the failure and consequent dissolution of Concert of Europe (1815-1822). (IP, I, 1925.)

Q 12. State the causes of the failure and the consequent dissolution of the Concert of Europe (1815-22). Examine Canning's dictum that it was "league to bind Europe in chains".

(IP, I, 1920)

After the fall of Napoleon the four Big Powers of Europe, Russia, Prussia, Austria and England felt the necessity of continuing their combination for sometime to come. They signed a treaty on November 20, 1815, on the day on which the Treaty of Paris was signed, for the purpose of consolidating the connections of the four sovereigns. The main object of the Quadruple Alliance were (1) to prevent Napoleon and his family from occupying any throne in Europe; (2) to reduce the military power of France, and (3) to crush the French

ideas of revolution. The four Powers agreed to renew their meetings at fixed periods, so that they could consult upon their common interests, and to consider measures necessary for the maintenance of peace and prosperity of nations. The Concert of Europe governed the international relations of the European States till 1822. They took the place of Napoleon and whenever thought desirable they met together in Congress. They met at Aix-la-Chapelle, Troppau, Laibach and Verona. France joined the Concert at Aix-la-Chapelle. The Alliance was then converted into the "moral pentarchy."

The Concert consisted of absolute monarchs with the exception of the Sovereign of England. The rulers of Russia, Prussia and Austria had predominance in it, and they carried the policy of intervention in Italy and Spain. The congressional system of international government was utilised for the purpose of suppressing the liberties of peoples. But this method did not appeal to the English sentiment of constitutionalism. Castlereagh as a minister of parliamentary England dissociated himself from the policy of intervention. France also agreed with England. The smaller States were opposed to this policy. When Canning became Foreign minister in England he protested against the policy of the Powers. He objected to the congressional system of Government as it did not consult the wishes of the peoples concerned nor did it consult the smaller powers. The employment of force in the internal affairs of the different States was highly objectionable. So he opposed the intervention of the Powers in the affairs of Spain, and invoked the aid of the President of the United States of America when the Spanish colonies there were threatened. He defined his policy as "Every nation for itself and God for us all." The famous Monroe doctrine broke the Concert. Canning remarked in exaltation "we have called in the New world to redress the balance of the old." Since then the Concert was discredited. Congresses no doubt were held afterwards, but there was no collective attempt to revive the doctrines of absolutism, to condemn revolution as such.

or to proclaim a general policy of intervention by force. The Concert failed because it attempted to promote and to enforce the monarchical principle upon the different States of Europe. It infringed the rights of the small States, and tried to introduce a system of uniform despotism. The States possessing parliamentary forms of Governments could not readily acquiesce in the methods of the Concert. Canning led the opposition and consequently the Concert collapsed.

Canning's dictum that it was "league to bind Europe in chains" is quite appropriate. It suppressed all liberal movements. The German movement was crushed by Austria at the instance of the congress at Aix-la-Chapelle. The liberal movement in Italy and Spain were suppressed and it failed when it attempted to re-establish Spanish despotism over the American Colonies. It could not interfere with Greece on account of the conflict of interests. In other cases it interfered and succeeded in imposing absolutism upon the unwilling population. Canning saved Europe by his opposition to the congressional system as it then existed.

FOREIGN POLICIES OF CASTLEREAGH AND CANNING.

Q 13. Discuss the foreign policies of Castlereagh and Canning. How far was the difference between their policies due to circumstances more than intention? (*P. U. 1918*)

The British Foreign Minister Castlereagh played a very important part in the history of Europe from 1812 till his death in 1822. He was the British representative at the Congress of Vienna, and it was at his instance that the Quadruple Alliance was formed with a view to continue the joint action of the Powers in European problems. The idea of congressional Government was entirely his. But he was not in favour of an alliance of all the signatories to the treaty of Vienna, which Tsar Alexander proposed. He did not believe that a Universal Alliance could be reduced into practice. He only wanted that the Powers which had brought about the overthrow of Napoleon by their combination should not separate on the cessation

which Castlereagh devised. He did not send British representatives to the meetings of the Powers to discuss the questions of Spanish America or Greece. By his refusal to join the Allies Canning undermined the congressional system of Government set up by his predecessor. His sentiments were nationalistic, and his view was clearly expressed in the passage "Every nation for itself and God for us all." Castlereagh was European in his outlook but he was actuated by the same desire to promote the interests of England as Canning. They differed in their methods, Castlereagh was diplomatic whereas Canning kept his programme before the public gaze.

Circumstances favoured Canning in developing his forward policy. The French danger was over and the co-operation of the European Powers was not so badly necessary in developing English trade. Castlereagh on the other hand had just come out of the crisis. He could not ignore the help that the Powers had rendered to England. He was therefore bound by the necessity of circumstances to remain friendly with the big Powers of the continent. As a minister in a Parliamentary Government he could not ignore the force of public opinion. But as a diplomatist he could not secede from the combination which he himself had brought into existence.

CANNING'S POLICY.

Q. 14. "I called the New World into existence to redress the balance of the Old." How far was this statement true, and what motives of policy led Canning to take the steps which he thus described? (*P. U. 1917.*)

The British Foreign Minister Canning made this pronouncement to the House of Commons when the independence of the Spanish Colonies in America were recognised. It was not an empty rhetoric. The British statesmen from Pitt downwards were seeking opportunity of establishing good relations with the colonies in the interest of trade. For sometime trade suffered on ac-

count of the prevailing anarchy in America. Spain found great difficulty in governing the colonies. The vast colonies had for sometime been trying for independence. When Ferdinand VII was dethroned by Napoleon these colonies disowned the Spanish rule; and on the restoration the movement for independence took a definite shape under the leadership of Bolivar. The Powers in Europe were willing to help Spain in suppressing the revolutionary movement. Canning who had already protested against the policy of interference in Spain now definitely refused to join them in discussing any measure of coercion. The policy of interference was a great menace to the smaller nationalities in Europe. There was no chance for any nation to obtain a form of Government which it desired on account of the police system of the despotic rulers. Canning on the other hand held that a nation had the right to determine its own form of Government as long as it left other nations to manage their own affairs. In pursuance of this policy he appointed consuls for the protection of British trade in the colonies in 1823, and informed France that though Spain might subdue her revolted colonies if she could, no other Power was justified in undertaking the task on her behalf.

President Monroe of the United States of America also announced the policy of his Government with regard to the colonies in his famous message to the Congress on December 2, 1823. The attitude of England and the United States checked the European aggression in America, and in 1825 the independence of Buenos Ayres, Colombia and Mexico was recognised by the Government of England. The rise of new republics was a curb on the policy of intervention of the Holy Allies. The defection of England from the Concert was a great blow to them. The smaller nationalities in Europe were saved from the coercion of the Big Powers. Within a short time Greece and Belgium became free, the Italian and German movements gained strength and by the middle of the century revolutionary movements cropped up in all parts of Europe for obtaining freedom.

The motives of the policy which led Canning to take these steps were first to obtain the good-will of the American colonies where British trade had a great chance of development, second to check the policy of intervention of the Powers so that each nation might adjust its own affairs in its own way, and lastly the English people felt the growth of influence of Austria and Russia in the deliberations of the Concert and this was not very pleasing to the English pride. Canning was the protagonist of a forward policy, and by taking up this attitude he made England once more occupy her place of honour in the comity of nations.

CHARACTER AND POLICY OF METTERNICH

Q 15 Attempt a critical examination of the character and policy of Prince Metternich. (*P U. 1928*)

Metternich dominated the councils of Europe from 1815 to 1848. Born in 1773, he acquired great knowledge of diplomacy and in 1803 he came to Paris as Austrian Ambassador and in 1806 he was sent as Ambassador to Berlin. Since 1809 he presided over the Foreign Ministry in Austria till he left Vienna in 1848. His was a unique personality and the monarchs and ministers of Europe looked up to him for guidance. He presided over the Congress at Vienna in 1815, and by his great diplomatic skill he managed to obtain the ready co-operation of the powerful Princes such as Tsar Alexander of Russia, and King Frederick William III of Prussia. He was a thorough going conservative and believed that only strong government of monarchs could maintain the peace of Europe. He had a contempt for Parliaments and constitutions. His policy has been defined in the passage "Neither to innovate nor to go back, but to keep things as they are." Whenever any attempt would be made for constitutional reforms it should be forcibly resisted by the intervention of the Powers.

He believed that the growth of liberal ideas would be dangerous to the peace of Europe. The Austrian

Empire was then in the mediæval stage. Feudalism was in its full force, and the cleavage between the privileged nobility and non-privileged peasantry was very great. Liberal ideas were sure to upset the old order of things. By the maintenance of the absolute authority of the monarch peace could be preserved. As the Austrian Empire consisted of a medley of races, Germans, Magyars, Slavs and others he felt that any sympathy with the spirit of nationalism would bring about the disintegration of the Empire. His system of Government was based upon distrust. One part was governed by men of another part, strict espionage and censorship was enforced, and he wanted that the policy he adopted in Austria should be extended to other countries in Europe. He crushed the liberal movement in Germany and persuaded Tsar Alexander to give up his advocacy of constitutional government. The Carlsbad decrees which he dictated to the German States were adhered to until 1848. They aimed at checking the free expression of opinions hostile to existing institutions, and at dealing effectively with the revolutions. Universities and the Press was strictly watched.

Metternich's policy was guided by the circumstances of Europe. He had watched at close quarters the experiment carried on in France. People had not then made sufficient progress in democratic ideas. The liberal movements were not always in able hands and people suffered more than gained by adopting democratic institutions. Moreover as he belonged to the privileged class he could not enter into the feelings of the non-privileged masses. He simply believed that order and good government were the only things necessary for the promotion of economic welfare. So long as Europe was suffering from exhaustion after the strenuous Napoleonic wars people acquiesced in the policy of strong government. But as soon as she recovered the normal condition the liberal tendencies began to influence the minds of the peoples. Metternich could not stem the tide of liberalism and nationalism. He had to acknow-

ledge the independence of Greece and of Belgium, he could not resist the overthrow of the Bourbon dynasty in France. Towards the end of his career he realised that the flood of nationalism was beyond his control. It must be said to his credit that he did not stick to his old views when he found that it was impossible to maintain them, but it was too much to expect that the veteran conservative would reconcile himself to the new order of things. He left the helm when he was unable to steer the boat. When Charles X of France was reviving all the old methods he gave him timely warning. He knew when to yield. He wielded power for such a long time because he thoroughly understood the weakness of others.

REACTIONARY AND LIBERAL POLICY.

Q. 16 What do you understand by—

(a) A reactionary policy.

(b) A liberal policy.

Illustrate your answer with particular reference to Metternich and Cavour. (P. U. 1930)

(a) The French Revolution attacked some of the well-established institutions of the Ancient Regime, such as, Feudalism monopoly of the privileged classes in State and Church, supreme control of the Church over society and government, monasteries and their estates, serf system, and many disabilities of the peasants and the common people. The nobility enjoyed all the privileges and the masses paid the heaviest taxes, had to render free labour, and laws and justice were different for different classes of people. These mediæval practices were swept away by the revolutionists and Napoleon completed the work of reformation by his systematic codes of laws. When the "legitimate" monarchs were restored to power according to the Vienna Settlement there was a wave of reaction. Metternich was the apostle of the doctrine of conservation. He believed that the innovations introduced by the revolutionists were dangerous to the well-being of the people. The authority of

the monarch must be maintained, he should be given full control over his domains and subjects, the divisions of the people into different classes should not be disturbed and the nobility should not be deprived of any of its privileges. To promote these objects Government may adopt any strong measures such as suppression of free expression of thoughts, of free exchange of ideas, and control of education in such a way that in the centres of education the spirit of revolt against authority might not be encouraged. Metternich introduced espionage, restriction of the freedom of the Press, and stopped the free association of the people. He did his best to suppress movements for setting up constitutional governments or for the extension of popular rights. The risings in Naples, Piedmont and Spain he crushed by forcing the Powers to adopt the policy of intervention. He suppressed the liberal movement in Germany by his famous Carlsbad decrees. His student organisations were shattered. He had no sympathy with the Greeks, Italians or Belgians. In economic affairs he did not believe in the policy of extensive exchange of goods with foreign countries. In every matter he wanted to keep things as they were—"Neither to innovate nor to go back but to keep things as they are."

(b) A liberal policy does not cling to the things of the past. It accepts change in the interest of progress. New ideas come into conflict with the old, and a liberal statesman does not shut his eyes to the tendencies of the times. He would, on the other hand, try to give a shape and direction to the new ideas. When the institutions of the Ancient Regime were found discredited people in every land were anxious for an extension of their rights, for the removal of the inequalities between one order and another, and for an establishment of the reign of law and justice so that every citizen may enjoy equal opportunity in life. Parliamentary reforms of 1832 were effected in pursuance of this policy of liberalism. Education was encouraged, trade and industry developed, and unnecessary restric-

tions upon the movement of men and goods removed, Corn Laws were abolished

Cavour of Italy embodied in himself the liberal principles. Since he became the Prime Minister of the Kingdom of Sardinia he threw himself heart and soul into all progressive movements for the attainment of the Unity of Italy. He had received training in the practical school of life, and possessed a constructive genius. He started a journal called *Il Risorgimento* in 1847, devoted to the object of constitutional reform. Since his discharge from the Army in 1831 he directed his attention to agriculture, and during his travels in France, Germany and England he carefully studied the Parliamentary system of government. He was always prepared to receive fresh ideas. He held that economic and industrial development was necessary for political progress. When he became the Prime Minister he did his best to develop the economic life of his people by a net-work of railways. Commercial treaties with France and England were concluded and agriculture and industry were developed in every possible way. He reduced the number of monasteries and convents, and effected great improvement in the schools. He welcomed scholars from other parts of Italy, and made Piedmont the refuge of the Italian patriots. His policy was the reverse of what Metternich stood for. The latter advocated stagnation while the former worked for progress. Cavour was preparing for national unity and social equality. Metternich tried to keep down nationalism and to maintain social inequality. The two represent two opposite schools of thought.

GREEK WAR OF INDEPENDENCE.

Q. 17. Give a short account of the Greek War of Independence. Account for the success of Greeks against Turkey.
(P. U. 1925.)

Q. 18. Account for the success of Greece in her struggles for independence.
(P. U. 1918.)

When the representatives of the European Powers met at Laibach to devise means of suppressing the

revolutions in Italy and Spain, news came of the rising of the Greeks. For sometime past there were signs of a Greek national revival. The Greeks were a cultured people and many of them lived outside their country. They loved the glories of Ancient Greece, spoke the same language, and belonged to the orthodox Greek Church. The Greek national movement started a Hellenic literary revival movement in Paris especially through the writings of Adamantios Koraes. The ideas of the French Revolution had penetrated into Greece, and secret societies were formed with the object of driving away the Turks from their country. The *Philike Hetaireia* enrolled 200,000 members by 1820. Although under foreign rule for centuries, the Greeks still retained their sense of unity and national self-respect.

Prince Alexander Hypsilanti who held the position of Hospodar in Wallachia and Moldavia raised the flag of revolution in Moldavia in February 1821. He did not receive the expected help from Russia, and was defeated by the Turks at Dragashan in Wallachia (June 19, 1821). He fled to Hungary where he died as a prisoner in 1828. The rising was suppressed by the Turks. The priests of the Greek Church fanned the flame of revolution. The Ottomans in the Morea were exterminated by the Greeks, who in retaliation murdered the Patriarch Gregorious (April 22, 1821) and carried on wholesale massacres of the Christians in Thessaly, Macedonia, and Asia Minor. This created a strong indignation among the Christian nations. But war was averted by Metternich and Castlereagh. The Greeks were determined to have freedom. They held a National Assembly in January, 1822, and issued a proclamation of Independence. The Turks showed their fury by murdering about 20,000 Greeks in the Island of Chios. Great sympathy was felt for the Greeks in every country but the Powers hesitated to recognise them as belligerents. Volunteers came from England, Germany and America and enlisted themselves in the Greek Army. The war went on for years together. In 1824 the Sultan called

in the aid of Mehemet Ali, the Pasha of Egypt, who sent his son Ibrahim to devastate Greece from Crete to Athens. The Powers could not stand as silent witnesses of the ruin of an old nation. Russia, France and England sent a note according to the Treaty of London demanding armistice. Austria and Prussia held aloof. The three Powers proposed in the Treaty that the Greeks should be granted autonomy, but should be required to pay an annual tribute to Turkey. They pledged to end the war, and were prepared to take some effective measures if Turkey did not give any satisfactory reply. The Russian, English and French fleets were ordered out to be ready for any emergency. Ibrahim, the son of Mehemet Ali, was asked not to allow a single vessel to come out of the harbour of Navarino which he had made as his base. Ibrahim wreaked his vengeance upon the people of the Morea, and when the admirals protested a battle ensued at Navarino in which the Turko-Egyptian ships were destroyed (October 20, 1827). The action exceeded the instructions of the Governments so Duke of Wellington apologised. The Egyptian and Turkish troops carried on their work of suppression. But Tsar Nicholas did not tolerate this. The Russians crossed the Pruth, occupied the Principalities, and the Russian fleet entered the Dardanelles, and in August 1829 they reached Adrianople. The Sultan was now forced to sign the Treaty of Adrianople. Unwilling to see Russia as an arbiter of the Near East England and France negotiated with Ibrahim to withdraw his troops from the Morea. The war came to an end. Greece which was first recognised as an autonomous State under the suzerainty of Turkey became fully independent in 1832 by the Treaty of London.

The success of the Greeks was due to several factors :—

As the descendants of the old Greeks they drew the sympathy of the European nations. But the international situation favoured the Greeks. There was a strong rivalry between Great Britain and Russia in the near East. Russia

was anxious to come into the Mediterranean on the dissolution of the Ottoman Empire. England was terribly afraid of the growth of the Russian influence. The Greeks expected help from the Tsar as he was the Head of the Orthodox Church. If Russia were allowed to help Greece then she would be able to push her way into the Mediterranean. So the British statesmen were anxious to help the Greeks. France was persuaded to join out of her enthusiasm for liberty and nationality. The principles of liberty and nationality no doubt created some enthusiasm but the Holy Allies were dead against these principles. The rivalry of England and Russia helped the Greeks in obtaining their independence.

FALL OF THE BOURBONS

Q. 19. What were the forces that overthrew Charles X? What forces set up Louise Phillipe? (P. U. 1918.)

Charles X was an extreme reactionary. He was the leader of the Ultra-Royalists. A bigoted Catholic and a tool in the hands of the Jesuits, he was a firm believer in the divine right of kings. He abandoned altogether the policy of reconciliation followed by his brother. From the beginning he tried to restore the authority of the church and the privilege and property of the *emigres*. The Church was not only to get back its confiscated property, but would have the power to control education, marriage and registration of births and deaths. A Catholic priest Abbe Frayssionus was appointed head of the University, and by his orders eminent scholars like Guizot, Cousin, Chateaubriand were dismissed. Another priest Bishop Tharin of Strasburg was appointed tutor to the posthumous son of Duc de Berri. The Catholic Church was opposed to all liberal movements, and directed its attack specially against the Press. The Villele ministry under its influence passed an Act introducing censorship of the Press, and making criticism of the church an offence. A more drastic measure was withdrawn on the strong opposition of the Peers.

The second measure which created strong criticism in the country was the legislation to indemnify the *emigres*

although the attempt to restore their property to them failed. An indemnity of 1,666 million Francs was sanctioned, but the money was not paid, only 30 million Francs had to be paid and at 5 per cent interest. To find this money the interest on government bonds was reduced from 5 to 3 per cent. This measure irritated those who had lent money to the Government.

An attempt was made to revive the law of primogeniture. A law was passed making theft of sacred vessels from a church a capital offence, but not enforced. The Chamber of Deputies which was reactionary in spirit and supported the ministry got its life extended to seven years from five. But the public opinion became too strong for the repressive policy. The National Guard was disbanded for demanding the dismissal of the Ministry. This step created great discontent among the citizens of Paris. The Ministry also lost its hold upon the chamber, and its majority was gradually reduced. With a view to secure a strong majority the chamber was dissolved towards the end of 1827 and a fresh election held early in 1828. But the results were disastrous as the opposition secured a majority. In these circumstances Villele was forced to resign, and in his place Martignac from the Right Centre was appointed minister. The new minister tried to follow a middle course which pleased neither the King nor the people. He was dismissed in April 1829, the king appointed Count Polignac, a leader of the emigres, as Premier. This was an open challenge to the Liberals and the Republicans. People now felt that the Bourbon King would never improve and a strong party was formed to replace Charles X by Louis Philippe, Duke of Orleans.

King Charles and the Premier Polignac tried to coerce the popular party by repressive measures. The Chamber of Deputies in an address to the King represented that an agreement of the wishes of the government with the wishes of the people was indispensable according to the Charter, and that it did not then exist. The King in his fury dissolved the Chamber and ordered a fresh election.

But in the election the ministry lost heavily and the opposition had a majority of 220 against 150.

Nothing daunted the reactionary King issued four ordinances. By the first the liberty of the Press was suspended. The second dissolved the Chamber of Deputies, the third reduced the number of Deputies to 258, of whom one-fifth had to be elected annually. And the fourth ordinance reduced the number of voters by making only the payers of land-taxes eligible to vote. These ordinances were considered by the people as a violation of the Charter. But the opposition was not yet thoroughly organised. The constitutionalist party was not prepared for an open revolt. The Republicans consisting of young men, students and labourers could not count more than 10,000 on their side. But they had the sympathy of the public and the soldiers were unwilling to fight against the popular party. By his reactionary measures Charles X had created a Revolution. When the Republicans opened fire on the 27th July in Paris, and the King realised that his position was untenable on the third day he offered to withdraw the Ordinances; and made terms with the insurgents. But the situation was now beyond his control. A Committee to guard the safety of person and property had been formed, the National guard had been re established, and plans were formed to offer the Crown to Louise Philippe, the Duke of Orleans. Charles offered to abdicate in favour of his grandson Henry V. But this was not accepted. He then left France and went to Britain. The Bourbon rule came to an end on account of the fact that it was restored with the help of the foreigners, it had no sympathy with the spirit of Modern France, and because it flouted the people by restoring the authority of the church and the old privileged order.

Louise Philippe was promoted to the throne because the House of Orleans had supported the Revolution. Louise Philippe was a popular Prince. He was a member of the Jacobin Club, and had fought at Valmy and Jemappes. His Palace was a meeting place for the liberal, artistic and intellectual society of Paris. He mixed freely with all

classes of people and sent his children to the Public schools. The Republicans felt that the attempt to establish a Republic in France was premature as all the parties were not united and that would embroil France with all Europe. Louis Philippe would accept a constitution, respect the tri-colour flag and receive the Crown at the hands of the people. These things helped him in getting into the throne. He became "the King of the French by the grace of God and the good-will of the people".

EFFECTS OF THE JULY REVOLUTION.

Q. 20. What were the effects upon Europe of the Revolution in France of 1830 ? (P. U. 1921).

The July Revolution of 1830 in France awakened an echo in Europe. It had repercussions in the countries dissatisfied with the Vienna Settlement. The French had defied the Powers by overthrowing the "legitimate" dynasty. They shook off the humiliation thrust upon them and now set up their own government. The success of the French led peoples in other lands to dream of their own liberation. Risings took place in Poland, Germany, Italy and Belgium, and there was a growing demand for constitutional advance in England, Spain, and other countries. The sentiment of nationality which the Powers ignored and in fact tried to crush burst out in strong currents. Belgium was the first to take action. The Belgians could not reconcile themselves to the union with the Dutch, with whom they had nothing in common either in language, religion or traditions. Besides, from the very beginning of the Union they had been placed in an inferior position, and they were treated as a conquered people. In spite of their numerical superiority there was only one Belgian as Minister out of seven, the Dutch was made the official language, and education was supervised by Dutch inspectors. The Belgian patriots organised a Revolution in August, 1830, and at first demanded autonomy for Belgium. The Dutch King William I tried to crush the rising, and sent troops to Brussels. The patriots formed a Provisional Government, and at a meeting of the States-General they proclaimed their independence. They drew up a new constitution, and elected Prince

Leopold of Saxe-Coburg as their King. King William referred the matter to the Congress of the Powers which met in London. The Belgians counted upon the support of France and England. As the Eastern Powers were busy with the rising in Poland they did not pay any attention to Belgium. King Louis Philippe of France wanted the throne for his son, but he was frustrated by Lord Palmerston of England. Finally the independence of Belgium was recognised by the Powers, and its neutrality guaranteed by a treaty (November 18, 1831). Holland however did not acquiesce in the decision till 1833, and did not sign the definitive Treaty till 1839.

The Poles felt the impulse of nationalism like the Belgians. They had suffered greatly in the hands of Russia, Prussia and Austria. Since their loss of independence in 1772 they had been treated very badly by their neighbours. After the Vienna Settlement Tsar Alexander tried to conciliate the Poles of the Kingdom of Warsaw by granting them a new constitution, and assuring them of civil liberty. But the Polish nobility who had enjoyed all the privileges in the ancient times did not like the reforms, and on the death of Alexander his successor Tsar Nicholas I suspended the constitution and withdrew the concession granted by his predecessor. This was greatly resented by the Poles who began to organise themselves in secret societies. The success of the revolutions in France and Belgium encouraged the Poles to rebel against their masters. Strong sympathy was expressed for them in France, Germany and Great Britain. But no Government was prepared to intervene. The rising was crushed by the Russian army in a year and Poland was put to greater repression.

There were small risings in some States of Germany but they all collapsed for want of a concerted plan. In Italy the Duke of Modena was driven out and the Duchess Maria Louisa of Parma fled. Risings also took place in the Papal States. With the help of the Austrian army these rebellions were suppressed. There were signs of unrest in Portugal and Switzerland. In England the movement for parliamentary reform was greatly accelerated.

WAR OF THE BELGIAN INDEPENDENCE.

Q. 21. Narrate the causes and events of the revolt of Belgium against the Crown of Holland in 1830 (P. U. 1928).

Belgium was united with Holland under the House of Orange-Nassau by the treaty of Paris (1814). Previous to this it formed part of France and before that it was included in the Empire of the Austrian Hapsburgs. With a view to create a strong barrier-state between France and the German Empire the United Kingdom was brought into existence. But the union was ill-assorted. In this Kingdom the Belgians were numerically superior as they were 3,500,000 against 2,000,000 Dutch. They differed in language and by religion the Belgians were Catholics whereas the Dutch were mostly Protestants and Calvinists. There was greater affinity between the French and the Belgians, than between the Dutch and the Belgians. The two provinces also followed different economic policies. The Belgians were industrialists and desired protection while the Dutch as farmers and traders followed the policy of free trade. These differences would have been removed if the King had adopted a conciliatory policy. He treated Belgium as a conquered country, imposed upon it disproportionate burden which denied it equal opportunities. The new constitution adopted by the King denied the Belgians representation according to their numerical proportion. There was constant friction between the Belgians and the Dutch. The Belgians resented the predominance of the Dutch in the State and army, and the adoption of the Dutch as the official language. The sentiment of the Belgians to grow as a separate nation was ignored, and the policy of the King was to fuse the two peoples into one.

The Belgians from the very beginning started a movement for larger liberty and self-government. They would have been happy if they had been granted autonomy under the Dutch Crown. Encouraged by the success of the July Revolution in France insurrections took place at Brussels on August 25, 1830. The King did not entertain the proposal of a personal union in place of real union, and sent

Dutch troops to crush the rebellion. The royal troops failed to suppress the national rising, and were driven out of Belgium. The Patriots formed a Provisional Government, and at a meeting of the States-General on October 1, proclaimed Belgium as an independent country, and a Congress was called to determine the future constitution. At this stage King William tried to conciliate by offering a few concessions. But it was too late. The nationalists had enlisted the sympathies of France and England, and the Congress decided to have a constitutional monarchy. The Dutch King still persisted in a policy of coercion. He would not recognise the independence of Belgium. The Powers were divided in their attitude. France supported the Belgians, and so did England, Prussia, Austria and Russia although not in favour of the revolution could not intervene on account of the rising in Poland. So the Powers assembled in Conference in London had to accept the independence of Belgium as an accomplished fact. Louis Philippe was anxious to get the throne of the new Kingdom for his son, but this was opposed by Palmerston of England, and finally Prince Leopold of Saxe-Coburg was elected as King. The Powers guaranteed the neutrality of Belgium by a treaty signed on November 18, 1831. But the Dutch King did not accept these arrangements. He sent 50,000 troops to Belgium, in defiance of the Powers. Leopold appealed to France and England. Louis Philippe took up the Belgian cause and sent an army to occupy Belgium. Lord Palmerston averted another European war by his tact and diplomacy. Holland was forced to withdraw from Belgium, and acquiesced in the separation in 1833, but not till 1839 was the independence and neutrality of Belgium ratified in a definitive treaty. The Vienna Settlement was thus upset, and a new Kingdom established with the guarantee of the Powers for neutrality.

ORLEANIST MONARCHY.

Q. 22. Examine the chief elements of strength and weakness in the Government of Louis Philippe, and the causes of its ultimate downfall. (P. U. 1921).

Q 23. Account for the fall of the Orleans Monarchy or of Napoleon III. (P. U. 1925)

Louis Philippe had no claims to the throne of France as he did not belong to the direct line of the "legitimate" rulers, the Bourbons, nor was his election supported by a plebiscite of the people. He came to the throne on account of a combination of circumstances. His family formed a branch of the Bourbon dynasty and therefore had some connection with royalty. Those who organised the July Revolution found that the establishment of a Republic in France was beset with difficulties. They therefore agreed to have a King, provided the King respected the tri-colour and accepted the principles of the Revolution. Louis Philippe was found acceptable on account of his sympathies with the Revolution and his urbanity. He was expected to rule as a constitutional monarch who would be guided by the wishes of the people. He agreed to stand by the constitution which had been revised by the Chamber of Deputies before the Crown had been offered to him. The new monarchy was welcomed by the people as it promised them peace and prosperity. Louis Philippe's policy was to maintain peace at home and abroad. He was tolerant in religious matters, and divested himself of the symbols of the ancient monarchy. He restored the tri-colour and the National Guard, and showed his respects to the memory of Napoleon. He, in his way, tried to follow the policy of conciliation. In place of the old aristocracy the middle classes now obtained political influence. The tax-payers of 200 Francs and more were eligible to vote, and of 500 Francs were eligible to stand as candidates. The poorer citizens had the right to join the National Guard. These changes important as they were, were not sufficient for the purpose of strengthening the democracy. Although Louis Philippe was called a "Citizen King" he was not a democrat. His Government was a Government by the middle class people, and all attempts to broad-base it upon democratic lines failed. The position of the King was further weakened by a change in the economic life of the people. France in the course of its gradual industriali-

sation developed all the characteristics of an industrial country. Under the influence of the socialistic thinkers like Simon, Fourier, and Louis Blanc the problems of labour became very urgent. The democrats and constitutionalists on the other hand demanded further extension of franchise. Societies were formed for demanding political rights. The King failed to deal with these problems in a statesmanlike manner.

For the first ten years of his reign there were constant changes of ministers. There were two conflicting theories regarding the position of the King. M. Thiers held the view that the "King reigns but does not rule", whereas M. Guizot was of opinion that the King had the full powers to rule. Louis Philippe himself was of the latter view, and since 1840 the Government was in the hands of Guizot. He strengthened his position by offering lucrative positions to members of the Chamber. The foreign policy of Louis Philippe was guided by a spirit of submission to England, and by a desire to conciliate other Powers. The French people missed the chances of winning glory abroad by war. People became disgusted with the weak Government. There was a general desire for change. Several forces were now at work to overthrow the Orleanist monarchy.

The Legitimists desired the restoration of the Bourbons, the white flag, and liberty in education. The Left consisting of the Republicans led by Lamartine, the Socialists under the leadership of Louis Blanc, and the Left centre under M. Thiers accused the Government of corruption, inactivity and of a weak foreign policy. They demanded parliamentary and electoral reforms. Their efforts at reforms were frustrated by Guizot with his assured majority in the Chamber. The proposals to lower the franchise, to forbid the deputies from holding offices, or to increase the number of voters failed. Guizot turned them down as coming from an interested few. The opposition parties organised a series of public banquets to draw up petitions for reforms. Feelings ran high when a banquet arranged to take place on February 22, 1848 was forbidden by the Government.

The working men and students marched through the streets with revolutionary cries. The February Revolution thus brought about by Louis Philippe and his minister Guizot carried both of them away.

The downfall of the Orleanist monarchy was due to its failure to read the situation accurately. France had no love for constitutional monarchy of the English type, nor did she appreciate the compromise of Louis Philippe's rule, as it was neither the rule of a religious idea as under legitimate Bourbons nor of a strong man like Napoleon nor of a democracy like the Republic of 1793. So the Legitimists, Bonapartists, Socialists, Republicans, Constitutionalists and Catholics were all combined against him. Louis Philippe did not appeal to the imagination of the people. His rule was based upon reason, and the influence of the middle classes. But the labourers became a Power in the industrialised France. The working classes preached the new doctrine of *droit au travail* (right to labour), and universal suffrage. Their claims were made the starting point of a campaign against Orleanist monarchy. The Revolution was brought about by this Socialist movement. The overthrow of Louis Philippe was inevitable as there were so many forces at work against him. The bourgeoisie in Power would not care for the downtrodden proletariat who were anxious for franchise as a remedy for their political impotence. The unpopularity of Louis Philippe was increased by a revived interest in Napoleonic legends. The National Guard went over to the revolutionary party, and the King had to save his life by a flight to England in disguise.

(The fall of Napoleon III will be discussed in its proper place).

FEBRUARY REVOLUTION.

Q. 24. Write a history of the Revolution of 1848 in France. Show how it led to the establishment of the Empire by Napoleon III. (P. U. 1926)

Louis Philippe was not a Legitimist monarch and he had to adopt a policy of repression with a view to maintain his

authority. Neither the Legitimists nor the Constitutionalists were satisfied with his government. The Catholics resented his policy of toleration, and the people generally did not approve of alliance with legitimist Powers abroad. They felt the humiliation of France by her submission to England in foreign affairs, or alliance with Austria in the matter of Switzerland. The Government was controlled by the middle class people who did not pay any attention to the interests of the poor working men. Since 1840 Guizot manipulated the machinery of Government by offering lucrative position to members of the Chamber. Assured of the support of the corrupt Chamber he resisted all attempts at reforms. The weakness of the Orleanist monarchy was increased by the growth of the Napoleonic Legend. New literature appeared to show the services rendered by Napoleon. People forgot the harsh features of the Napoleonic despotism, and remembered the great General who had saved the honour of France at a critical moment, and brought to her glory. They felt that by a cruel destiny his liberal plans for France and Europe were shattered. They were bored by the policy of inactivity of Louis Philippe and desired for a change. There was a clamour for the return of a successor of Napoleon.

The social discontent was, however, the most powerful factor. The new doctrine of Socialism preached by Simon, Fourier and Louis Blanc had inspired hopes of a new order of things. The publication of Louis Blanc's "Organisation of Labour" in 1839 marked a new epoch in the history of the democratic movement. Workers were to be supported at the expense of the State; and a general desire was felt that only a republic established on democratic lines would solve their difficulties. Demand for electoral reform came from various quarters, which Guizot brushed aside. Measures proposed by the opposition parties to forbid the Deputies from holding offices, to increase the number of voters, to lower the qualifications of the voters, or to enfranchise the National Guard were all resisted by the Ministry. The attitude of the Government led the opposition parties to form a coalition. They wanted to organise public

opinion by holding banquets where petitions were drawn up in favour of the needed reforms. Numerous banquets were held during the winter of 1847, and public sentiment was excited. All the opposite parties were determined to bring about the overthrow of the Guizot ministry which they held responsible for the maintenance of the authority of the middle class and the introduction of corruption in public life. The demonstrations in favour of reforms were denounced by Guizot. The crisis was precipitated by an order of the Government forbidding a grand banquet arranged to take place on February 22. A large number of Deputies had promised to attend the banquet. The order was received with great indignation. The Deputies and Republicans decided to remain aloof, but the feelings of the people were excited. A large crowd of working men and students gathered together at Place de la Concorde in the morning of February 22, with cries of "Hurrah for reform" and there were signs of a great commotion. Reports of riots came from different quarters. Gunshops were plundered and in the evening a pile of chairs was set fire to in the Tuileries. The next day the riots spread to the western parts of Paris and the King now dismissed Guizot and asked Mole to form a ministry. This gave satisfaction to the people, but in the evening the mob was fired upon in the Boulevard of the Capuchins before the ministry of Foreign Affairs, where Guizot lived. The number of casualties was 23 killed and 30 wounded. The bodies of the dead were taken on a cart by Republicans, to excite public feelings. The city now prepared for a revolution. Everywhere were heard cries of "Long live the Republic".

Mole failed to form a ministry. The angry citizens of Paris erected barricades all over the city and the soldiers were reluctant to attack them. Finding his position insecure Louis Philippe fled to England followed by Guizot. He had abdicated in favour of his grandson, but the Chamber of Deputies threatened by the angry mob set up a Provisional Government. The Socialists assembled at Hotel de Ville proclaimed the establishment of a Republic. The moderate Republicans joined them and the two

Parties combined in establishing the Republic and a National Constituent Assembly was elected on the basis of direct, secret, manhood suffrage to draw up a constitution. The Revolution was now complete.

This Revolution was the work of a few citizens of Paris, but it was accepted by the entire population of France. A new constitution was drawn up on the principles that all authority emanated from the people. It was promulgated on November 4. In the election of the President, Louis Napoleon, a nephew of Napoleon Bonaparte, obtained 5,400,000 votes against 1,770,000 for the other two candidates put together. He appealed to the sentiments of the people as the successor of the great General. He was supported by the vast majority of the peasants and the Royalists who also did not like to vote for the Republican candidates. People believed that with the return of a Napoleon to power France would be able to regain her lost glories. He utilised his popularity in getting himself recognised as the Emperor. The French people also realised the dangers of communism. The National workshops increased the burden upon the people without reducing the distress of the labourers. The Catholics carried on a propaganda against the Republic. Louis Napoleon also assured the people that he was anxious to continue the policy of Napoleon the Great. By a *Coup d'état* at first his term of office was extended to ten years, and the next year he assumed the title of the Emperor. The transformation of the Republic into an Empire became so easy because France required a strong man to guide the affairs of State. There was want of faith in the different classes, the propertied classes were afraid of socialism, and the workingmen had no faith in the middle class. The parliamentary form of Government was not understood by the common people who felt the necessity of personal touch which Napoleon promised to supply. So they easily agreed to give to Louis Napoleon which they denied to Louis Philippe. People were satisfied with their right to vote but did not care to wield the authority, and therefore they gladly accepted the return of an Empire with the promise

of peace and prosperity at home and glory abroad.

Q. 25. Describe briefly the effect of the Revolution of 1848 in France on the rest of Europe.

(*P. U. 1928.*)

Q. 26. Give some account of the extent and importance of the Revolution of 1848.

(*P. U. 1931.*)

The February Revolution in France was the signal of a conflagration throughout Europe. The revolution in France was the result of the Socialist movement to establish the "Right to work." In other parts of Europe the idea of Liberty and the spirit of Nationality produced strong upheavals. There were already risings in Switzerland and Italy, but the success of the revolution in France encouraged the peoples in Austria, Hungary, Germany, Prussia and Central Italy to make another attempt to obtain their desired objects. In Belgium, Holland and Denmark attempts were made to effect electoral and constitutional reform, in Northern Italy, Schleswig-Holstein and Hungary the movement took the form of overthrowing the foreign rule, and in England the Chartist Movement echoed the democratic doctrines. Vienna was however the real focus of the revolutionary movement as it was the centre of Autocracy for thirty years. Metternich tried his best to stem the tide of progress in Europe by his policy of coercion, repression and intervention. But his great achievement, the Vienna Settlement had been attacked, and the right of intervention challenged. The successful revolutions in France had given an impetus to the liberal movements in other parts of Europe. The forces of disintegration were already at work in the Hapsburg Empire which consisted of a number of races, *viz.* Germans, Magyars, Slovaks, Czechs, Poles, Rumanians, Croats, Slavs and Italians. The spirit of nationalism gradually found greater acceptance, and the different races constituting the Empire were desirous of organising themselves in nation-states. The national movements were organised in Bohemia and Hungary. The national movement in Italy threatened the Austrian rule in Lombardy-Venetia. In Austria itself

people expressed their desire for a democratic government. Metternich was too old to control the new forces. The Estates of Lower Austria demanded the establishment of a parliamentary regime, a free Press, and reforms in local government and administration of justice. The liberal movement in Austria was joined by students and professors who led a demonstration to the Emperor on March 12. Riots took place in Vienna and the troops went over to the mob. Metternich resigned and the Emperor was forced to promise a constitution on the lines of Belgium (March 15).

The Magyars in Hungary led by Louis Kossuth demanded the liberation of their country. In a fiery speech on March 3 he urged the Hungarians for immediate action. Emboldened by the fall of Metternich and the grant of a constitution to Austria the Hungarian Diet passed a number of reform measures which the Nationalist Party had been advocating so long, such as a democratic legislature, responsible ministers, abolition of feudalism, and complete autonomy for Hungary. To a deputation from Hungary the King granted everything they wanted. (March 31). Hungary became a free country with a national Army and all the marks of a fully autonomous state.

On the outbreak of revolution in Austria and Hungary the nationalists in Bohemia demanded civil liberty, equality between Germans and Czechs and a fusion of the Provincial Assemblies of Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia (March 15). A deputation waited upon the Emperor who granted their demands in full. There was however keen rivalry between the Germans and the Czechs. Alarmed by the proposal of the Germans to send delegates to the Convention of Frankfort, the Czechs called a Pan-Slavic Congress at Prague (June 2), in which they formulated a project for the union of all the Slav peoples. Excited by the speeches in the Congress the mob broke out into an insurrection and attacked the residence of Windisch Gratz, the Austrian military Commandant in Prague. The infuriated General bombarded the city and crushed the revolution. The failure

of the revolution to Benevento led to the suppression of the reforms in Austria and Hungary.

The news of the fall of Louis Philippe excited the Germans in Prussia, Baden, Wurtemberg, Bavaria and Saxony. Wild demonstrations were held in Berlin with the cries of "Liberty and Equality." King Frederick William IV called a Provisional Diet to consider a new constitution. In a collision between the Police and the mob about 200 men were killed (March 18). The King tried to pacify the mob by expressing his regret at what had happened and issued a proclamation on March 21 to the effect that Prussia had been merged in Germany. At the same time arrangements were made by a few liberals who met at Heidelberg at the invitation of Heinrich von Gagern the minister at Cassel-Darmstadt for a *Vor-Parliament* to meet in Frankfort. The Vor-Parliament met on May 31, and resolved to have a German federation, with two Chambers. The details were to be settled at a National Constituent Assembly elected by universal suffrage. The Assembly or as it is called the Frankfort Parliament met under the presidency of Heinrich von Gagern (May 18, 1848). Much time was wasted in discussing the first principles, and they took about six months to settle the fundamental rights of the people. It was decided by a majority that only the German speaking States would be included in the Empire and that the King of Russia would be offered the title of the "Emperor of the Germans." But when the offer was made to him Frederick William IV declined to accept it at the hands of the people. Baffled in its attempt to bring about unity the Frankfort Parliament was dissolved.

The revolutionary activities had started in Italy earlier than in France. A rising took place at Palermo in Sicily and within a month the island had freed itself from the Neapolitan rule. The insurrection spread to Naples where King Ferdinand conceded a constitution (January 29). King Charles Albert also drafted a constitution for his Kingdom. The Duke of Tuscany, and Pope Pius IX followed suit. But the movement for unity could not grow

so long as Austria ruled in Northern Italy. The news of the fall of Metternich led the people of Milan to revolt against the Austrian Government. Marshal Radetsky was compelled to withdraw from Lombardy when a Provisional Government was set up (March 17). The Venetians under the leadership of David Manin declared the establishment of the Republic of St. Mark (March 23). The rulers of Parma and Modena fled, and the King Albert of Piedmont declared war on Austria. The armies of Tuscany, Naples and of the Pope joined the tri-colour flag of a United Italy. There was a wave of sentiment in favour of the union of North Italy under the hegemony of Sardinia. Mazzini hurried back from his exile to fight in the cause of Italian Unity. But the Italians were defeated at the battle of Costozza on July 25. Radetsky re-entered Milan. The King of Naples withdrew his troops and the Italian movement collapsed. Mazzini with the help of Garibaldi established the short-lived Republic of Rome, and a Republic was set up in Tuscany. King Charles Albert made another attempt to drive the Austrians out. But his defeat at Novara (March 23, 1849) decided the fate of Italy. The Republics were suppressed and absolutism restored in the Peninsula.

The influence of the Revolution was also felt in other countries. The working men got up a monster demonstration and proposed to hold a Peoples' Parliament in London on April 10, 1848. Government took special measures to crush the movement and their petition containing 7,000,000 signatures was discredited when it was found to contain some fictitious names. Since then the Chartist movement collapsed. In Holland King William II was forced to grant a new constitution establishing a responsible ministry. The constitution of the Swiss Republic was revised and a federal constitution was drawn upon the lines of that of the United States of America. The King of Denmark also agreed to have a Parliament with two houses. The commotion was felt in other countries, such as Spain, Poland, Russia and Ireland, but without any appreciable result. The February Revolution in France thus produced a

great ferment throughout Europe and in many cases brought about important results. The first flush of success no doubt died out in most cases, but some good came out of it. Feudalism disappeared for ever, taxes were distributed among the different classes more equitably, and the people were better prepared for democratic government.

Q 27. Discuss the opinion that "the movements of 1848 had nothing in common save their date." (*P.U. 1918*).

Q 28. Contrast the causes which led to the revolutionary movements of 1848 in France, Italy and the Austrian Empire respectively. (*P.U. 1917*).

The revolutionary movements of 1848 started in the different countries with their local objects. The underlying causes were different in the different cases. The common thing was the spirit of revolution. All the countries had some grievances to redress, but they were not identical. There was a desire on the part of every people to have some change, the reforms that they so keenly felt. The French Revolution which was precipitated by the unwise action of Louis Philippe and his minister Guizot roused up the peoples everywhere to settle their problems in their own way. The French movement inspired mainly by the ideals of Socialism was strengthened by the hatred of the Legitimists, Bonapartists and the Republicans towards the absolutism of the Orleanist monarchy, which had practically few friends. The Government of Louis Philippe was based upon the narrow principle of expediency. It was neither based upon the ancient traditions, nor was it based upon the good-will of the rising industrial classes. The common people did not gain anything from it, on the other hand by a method of improperly influencing the legislature it tried to maintain its authority. The opposition parties made a common cause and overthrew the rule of Louis Philippe. It was the work of a few men, but it received the support of the entire nation. The movement in France was in essence a social revolution.

In the Austrian Empire the Revolutions were caused

by the spirit of nationalism and liberalism. The conglomerate Empire consisted of different nationalities, such as Germans, Magyars, Czechs, Slovaks, Croats, Roumanians and Italians. The idea of nationalism learnt from the Napoleonic system of government caught hold of the people's imagination. Metternich ignored the sentiment of one State for one nation and in the Austrian Empire he wanted the German element to predominate. He also did not encourage the development of constitutional government on democratic lines. Moreover he tried to stop the introduction of liberal ideas from abroad. The Hungarians started a movement to have complete autonomy, the Czechs in Bohemia started a Pan-Slav movement. In Austria itself the movement took the form of constitutional progress on liberal lines. The Austrian Empire suffered from the disintegrating forces.

The German and Italian movement on the other hand was a movement for unity and liberal government. The German people were scattered in a number of States, and they were still in the state of mediaeval autocracy. The liberal movement started by the students had been crushed by Metternich with the help of the Carlsbad decrees. But still the Germans cherished the hope of unity. The French Revolution of 1848, stirred these sentiments once again, and a German Convention was held at Frankfort. The insurrections in Berlin led to the grant of a new constitution.

The Italian movement had three main features. There was first a strong desire among the Italians to remove from Italy the influence of the Hapsburg family, and to release Northern Italy from the rule of the Austrians. Secondly in almost every Italian State there was a desire for constitutional government on democratic lines. Some Princes adopted a halting policy under the threat of Austrian intervention. Lastly the Young Italy party was educating the people for a United Italy. The early risings in Sicily and Naples were due to the desire of establishing a liberal system of government. The revolution in Lombardy was caused by the desire of the people to overthrow

the Austrian rule. Later on it took the form of a movement for Unity. The causes which affected France or the underlying forces at work in Austria did not operate in Italy.

It may therefore be said that the movements of 1848 had nothing in common save the date.

THE CRIMEAN WAR.

Q. 29. Summarise the causes and the results of the Crimean War. How did it further affect the union of Italy?

(P. U. 1917).

The causes of the Crimean War (1853-56) may be thus summarised.—

(1) Russia was contemplating long since an expansion of her territories towards the Mediterranean at the expense of Turkey. A proposal had been made to England that Russia should occupy Constantinople, and as a compensation England might occupy Egypt and Crete. This proposal was not entertained by the British Foreign Minister, Lord Palmerston.

(2) Since the Powers had begun to interest themselves in the Eastern Affairs a new problem regarding the protection of the Christian subjects of the Sultan developed. The Orthodox Christians looked up to the Tsar of Russia, the Catholics to France, and the few Protestants to England. Louis Napoleon tried to conciliate the Catholic sentiment of the French people by persuading the Porte to recognise the French right over the Holy Places in Palestine. The concession was greatly resented by Tsar Nicholas who demanded the Porte its immediate rescission. The Sultan by a diplomatic trick tried to satisfy both, but the Tsar was not satisfied. He hated Napoleon for assuming the title of Emperor, and demanded the Porte to recognise his right to protect the Holy Places and the Orthodox subjects of the Sultan in the Balkans. The Porte was not prepared to admit this extravagant claim. Prince Menshikoff was sent on a mission to Constantinople to put forth

their demands. At the instance of the English Ambassador at Constantinople, Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, the Porte conceded the Russian demand to protect the Holy Places, but refused the other request. The reply did not satisfy the Russians and Prince Menschi koff withdrew from Constantinople (May 22, 1853). Russia considered that her ambition would not be fulfilled without recourse to arms. An Army crossed the Pruth and occupied the Principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia.

France and England could not allow Turkey to be thus stampeded. England was all along anxious to prevent the expansion of Russia, and France desired glory abroad. A Conference of the representatives of England, France, Austria and Prussia met at Vienna in July and a joint Note was presented both at St. Petersburg and Constantinople. The Sultan maintained that the Porte had the full right to protect the Christian subjects according to the Treaty of Kamardji. The Powers were divided. Austria and Prussia adhered to the original note, but England and France refused to put pressure upon Turkey.

Early in October the Sultan demanded the evacuation of the Principalities within fifteen days, on the failure of which war was formally declared on October 23. In the meantime the British and French fleets had reached the Bosphorus, although Russia and the Western Powers were still at peace. When the Turks attacked the Russians vigorously on the Danube the Russian fleet destroyed a Turkish squadron at Sinope (November 30, 1853). This incident known as the "massacre of Sinope" decided the course of England and France. An ultimatum was sent to Russia to evacuate the Principalities by the 30th April, 1854, on the failure of Russia to submit to the ultimatum France and Britain declared war. In pursuance of a Convention with Britain and France the Kingdom of Sardinia joined the allies early in 1855.

RESULTS OF THE WARS.

The war came to an end early in 1856 when the Powers met in Conference at Paris. The peace terms were

finally settled in the Treaty of Paris (March 30, 1856), the main provisions of which were -

(1) Turkey was henceforth to be respected as a fully independent State, and no power would intervene between the Sultan and his subjects.

(2) The Sultan promised to ameliorate the condition of his subjects irrespective of creed or race.

(3) The Black Sea was neutralised, no "flag of war" could be seen there, and there would be no naval or military establishment and no foreign war-ship could pass through the Straits.

(4) The freedom of navigation on the Danube was maintained, under the control of an international commission.

(5) Moldavia and Wallachia with a strip of Bessarabia would become independent under the suzerainty of the Porte. Liberties of Serbia were similarly guaranteed.

(6) Kars would be restored to Turkey and the Crimea to Russia.

(7) Turkey was henceforth admitted into the Comity of Nations.

The main result of this war was the growth of a consciousness among the smaller nationalities in the Balkans. They developed a sense of self-respect and in course of time demanded complete freedom. The ambitions of Russia were completely frustrated. The neutralization of the Black Sea was of special interest to England as it made her route to India safe.

The Crimean war furthered the union of Italy because Cavour realised that it was difficult to achieve the unity of Italy without the help of some other Power. When the Crimean War was not progressing satisfactorily he offered the aid of the Sardinian army to France and Britain. This timely offer was appreciated by the Allies. Cavour had an opportunity of attending the Con-

ference at Paris, and presenting the Italian case. He enlisted the sympathies of Napoleon, who promised to help Italy. The Crimean war thus proved useful to the Italians.

THE ITALIAN RISORGIMENTO

Q. 30. "The dream of a long line of patriots, from Dante to Mazzini, had come true." Explain this with reference to the Italian Risorgimento from 1848—1870 (P. U. 1931).

It was the dream of the Italian patriots to bring about the unity of their land which had been divided into a number of small States since the middle ages. Dante in his poems appealed to the sentiment of Italian unity. This idea was promoted through art and science in the period of Renaissance. Napoleon had helped the growth of this idea, but the Powers assembled at Vienna shattered the hopes of the Italians. To Metternich Italy was "simply a group of independent States united under the same geographical term." But the Italian patriots under the inspiration of Mazzini were awakened to the consciousness of national unity. Love of the country became a religion to them.

Secret societies known as the Carbonari were formed with a view to bring about the liberation of Italy from the control of the Austrians. Revolutions took place in Naples and Piedmont in 1820 and 21, but they were suppressed by Austrian arms. The same fate met the risings in Modena, Parma and the Papal States in 1830. The failure of the Carbonari movement led Mazzini to form his *Young Italy* with a more constructive programme. He kept as his motto "Liberty, equality, humanity, God, sovereign and the law of God." His idealism fascinated the Youth of Italy who flocked in numbers to sacrifice their lives for making Italy united and free. Mazzini made the idea of unity very popular, and a national movement started to reach the goal. The minds of the people were prepared for the

coming event by the writings of a number of thoughtful writers. Men of all sections desired liberal government and a united Italy. The period when the Italians entertained hopes of liberating the country from foreign domination and effecting unity within the peninsula has been called the *Risorgimento* or resurrection. Some of the Princes, specially Pope Pius IX, and King Charles Albert of Sardinia expressed their sympathies with this movement. The naturalists in their Congress helped the growth of the idea of unity. Cavour in his paper entitled *Il-Risorgimento* gave a definite shape to the political aspirations of the people. Early in 1848 there were signs of a great upheaval in every part of Italy. Early in January risings took place in Sicily and Naples. The King of Piedmont had already granted a constitution to his subjects. The February Revolution in France brought about a strong movement under the leadership of the King of Piedmont to drive Austria out of Italy. A Republic was established in the Papal States with Mazzini at the head. But the defeat of Charles Albert at Novara was a terrible blow to the national cause. Within a short time the Roman Republic collapsed, Mazzini left Italy and Garibaldi went once again into exile. A wave of reaction passed all over the country on the failure of this movement. Though the insurrections of 1820, 1831, and 1848 failed the desire for unity did not abate. The idea of winning her object through her own efforts had to be revised.

A new method was pursued by Cavour, the minister of the Kingdom of Sardinia. He had realised after the failure of the revolution of 1848 that Italy would not be able to drive out Austria without the help of some other Power. He calculated that France was the only neighbour likely to help Italy. During the Crimean war he found an opportunity of entering into an alliance with France and England. The Sardinian troops under General La Marmora gave a good account of Italian ability and heroism. Cavour attended the Peace Conference at Paris and found an opportunity of presenting

the case of Italy before the representatives of other Powers. There he enlisted the sympathies of England and obtained a promise of active support from Napoleon III. The understanding with Napoleon was reached at an interview at Plombières, (July 21, 1858). It is believed that Napoleon agreed to come to the aid of Italy when Austria would appear as the aggressor, and a joint army would drive Austria out of Lombardy and Venetia, and then with Parma, Modena and parts of the Papal States would be added to Piedmont, and thereby the whole of Northern Italy would be brought under one King. A Central Kingdom would be created with Tuscany and the rest of the Papal States, the Pope would rule over Rome and the adjoining parts, and Naples would remain independent in the South. Savoy and Nice which belonged to France geographically would be given to Napoleon in reward of the services rendered.

Assured of the support of Napoleon Cavour made preparation for the coming conflict. He had established a Society in 1857 called the National Union and enlisted the co-operation of the Federalists and the Republicans in fighting for independence and unity. Funds were collected for purchasing cannons and war materials, and volunteers from different parts of Italy flocked under the banner of Piedmont. Within a short time an effective army of 90,000 was got ready. Early in 1859 Napoleon warned the Austrian Ambassador that the relations between Austria and France were not as satisfactory as formerly. Cavour obtained the sanction of a war loan from the Piedmontese Parliament. Garibaldi organised a band of volunteers known as the Chasturs of the Alps. Austria protested against this preparation for war, and sent an ultimatum to Turin, demanding disarmament within three days. Cavour won his point when Austria took up the offensive. He obtained the moral support of the European Powers to the Italian cause.

Austria declared war on April 10, 1859 and invaded Piedmont. The people of Tuscany joined Piedmont

when the Grand Duke left the country. A rising took place in Modena, the ruler of Parma was driven out, and the Papal troops were defeated in the Romagna and the Legations. Napoleon III reached Italy with his army on May 12.

After a series of battles the Austrians were driven out of Lombardy and thrown into the Quadrilateral. When victory was on their side Napoleon concluded an armistice with Emperor Francis Joseph at Villafranca (July 8), without reference to Victor Emmanuel. The preliminaries were finally embodied in the Treaty of Zurich (November 10, 1859). The terms were not agreeable to Cavour. Lombardy was to be made over to Piedmont, but Venetia would remain under Austria. An Italian Federation would be formed under the presidency of the Pope, and the Grand Dukes of Modena, Parma and Tuscany would be restored to power. Victor Emmanuel agreed to accept the terms so far as they affected him. Cavour in protest resigned the ministership. The peoples of the Grand Duchies would not have their rulers, and the constitutional convention of Romagna declared and that they would not have the temporal government of the Pope, and that they would like to be annexed to the Kingdom of Sardinia. The smaller States of Modena, Parma and the Romagna adopted the Sardinian constitution, and placed their post offices under Sardinian control. France and Austria were not happy at this state of things, but could not use force on account of the attitude of England. Early in January 1860 Cavour came back to power, and persuaded Napoleon to submit the question to the plebiscite of the peoples concerned. The plebiscite was taken in March, by virtue of which the States of Central Italy were annexed to Piedmont, and Savoy and Nice to France. The loss of Savoy and Nice was greatly felt by the Italians. The whole of Northern Italy except Venetia and the Central Italy came under one rule. The Papal States and the two Sicilies still remained separate.

The next stage was the annexation of the Kingdom of Naples. This was done by Garibaldi who with his thousand "Red shirts" went to join the insurrection in Sicily in May 1860. He defeated the Neapolitan troops at Palermo and was appointed dictator of the island in the name of Victor Emmanuel (August 5, 1860). He then crossed over to Naples, and on his approach the Government of Naples collapsed and the King fled (September 6, 1860). There also he became dictator in the name of Victor Emmanuel. Thus Sicily and Naples were added to the Northern Kingdom of Italy. The troops of Victor Emmanuel also annexed the Marches and Umbria within the Papal States. Victor Emmanuel was now proclaimed as the King of Italy. Only Rome and Venice remained outside his Kingdom.

During the Austro-Prussian War in 1866, Italy obtained Venetia for declaring war against Austria, and in the Franco-Prussian war the French troops were withdrawn from Rome, and the Italians occupied Rome (September 20, 1870), Italy was united and Rome became her Capital. The dream of the patriots was thus fulfilled.

Q 31. Estimate the work of Cavour, Garibaldi, and Mazzini as "Makers of Italian Unity" (P. U. 1917)

Q. 32. Discuss the respective contributions of Mazzini, Cavour and "the Gentleman King" to the resurrection of Italy. (P.U 1926)

(N. B. In the question of 1917 Victor Emmanuel is omitted, and in the question of 1926 Garibaldi, is omitted).

The philosophy and enthusiasm of Mazzini, bravery of Garibaldi, statesmanship and diplomacy of Cavour and Victor Emmanuel II combined with the burning patriotism and sacrifice of millions of Italians brought about the Unity of Italy, and gave her a new life.

Mazzini was the son of a physician and professor. Born in Genoa in 1805 he was trained as a lawyer and

received his initiation in patriotic service when he witnessed the miseries of the "refugees of Italy" who had fled to Genoa after the failure of the Revolution in Piedmont in 1821. Since then he formed a resolution in his mind to release Italy from foreign domination and to unite the Italians in one national State. He joined the secret Society known as the *Carbonari* and was imprisoned in 1830 for his complicity in the revolution of that year. On his release after six months he was obliged to leave Italy and remained in exile till his death excepting for a short period during the revolution of 1848. He started a more constructive programme than that of the *Carbonari* and felt that the national movement must be inspired by a moral and religious impulse, and that patriotism must be elevated to a higher plane. From his exile at Marseilles he started the *Young Italy* Society with the object of liberating and unifying Italy and establishing a Republic. His idealism fascinated the youth of Italy, and within a short time thousands of them joined his Society. The old indifference among the Italians disappeared and in every part of the country people began to think of a United Italy, free and independent. The birth of the national movement was due to the writings of Mazzini and to his fervent patriotism. From his exile he exhorted his country men to stand for unity, independence, freedom and Republic. His ideas formed the real lever of the Italian Revolution.

During the Revolution of 1848 he came to Italy and with the help of Garibaldi established the Republic of Rome (February 9, 1849). He was placed at the head of the Government, and then invited the Italians to elect Deputies to a Constituent Assembly for bringing about the unity of the country. Another republic was established in Tuscany but the people in Lombardy were in favour of an annexation to the Kingdom of Piedmont. The leadership of the next war with Austria was vested in Charles Albert, but on his defeat at Novara the Austrians occupied Parma and Modena and restored the absolute Grand Duke in Tuscany. Rome held out for sometime, but the Republicans were

defeated by the French on June 30, 1849, and the Pope was re-established in power. Mazzini once again went into exile. He never returned to the land of his birth, but in his exile he remained an inspiration to his fellow-countrymen. He never compromised his idealism, and he did not return to Italy when she attained unity and freedom because she did not accept republicanism.

Garibaldi: The most important condjutor of Mazzini was Joseph Garibaldi. He was born in Nice in 1807. An adventurous sailor, a bold soldier and an ardent revolutionist he joined the "Young Italy" Society of Mazzini and took part in the unsuccessful insurrection in Savoy in 1834. For his share in the revolution he was condemned to death, but he managed to escape to South America where he lived for 10 years, and visited various parts of the world as a sailor. In the Revolution of 1848 he returned to Italy and fought in the Republican Army. He valiantly defended Rome, but on the fall of that city he went to Venice, from there he went to the United States of America, and in 1854 he came back to Italy and settled in the island of Caprera. In the war of Italian Independence in 1849 he was placed at the head of the volunteers known as the "Hunters of the Alps", who were considered as the embodiment of the "romance of the daring and poetry of the National cause".

He was not satisfied with the results of the war, and still cherished the ideals of unity. He felt bitterly the loss of Nice to which he belonged by birth, and when Victor Emmanuel II and Cavour were sitting on their oars after bringing about the Unity of Northern Italy, Garibaldi with his thousand "Red shirts" joined the insurrection of Sicily. By his daring and boldness Sicily and Naples were added to the Kingdom of Piedmont. If Cavour and Victor Emmanuel had not stood in his way he might have carried the work of unification still further. When diplomacy failed Garibaldi succeeded by his daring.

Cavour. The unity and independence of Italy were however brought about by the skilful diplomacy and able statemanship of Count Camillo Cavour. Born in 1810 he joined the Army as an engineer in the beginning of his

career. He suffered imprisonment on account of his liberal views. He resigned the commission in 1831 and devoted himself to the improvement of agriculture. He visited France, Germany and England, and studied the parliamentary system of government. He felt that economic and industrial development was absolutely necessary for political progress. He started a paper called *Il Risorgimento* which gave a shape to the aspirations of the people. When King Charles Albert granted a constitution to Piedmont Cavour was elected to the first Parliament (1847). After the unsuccessful revolution of 1848 Cavour became a minister, and was placed at the head of the government in 1852. He co-operated with Victor Emmanuel in making Piedmont the Premier State in Italy, and placing her at the head of the national movement. He found that Italy would not be able to reach her goal without the co-operation of some other Power so during the Crimean war he entered into an alliance with England and France, and at the Peace Conference at Paris enlisted the sympathy of the European Powers in the Italian cause. He persuaded Napoleon III to fight on the side of Italy, and the process of unification started with the War of Independence in 1859, which Cavour did his best to bring about. He greatly resented the defection of Napoleon at Villafranca, and left the Government. After eight months he once again took up the helm and when the smaller States were anxious to join Piedmont he persuaded Napoleon III to submit the question to the plebiscite of the peoples concerned. His brilliant statesmanship was responsible for the success of this movement. He indirectly helped Garibaldi in his voyage to Sicily, and by a tactical move saved Italy from intervention of the Powers when Garibaldi was threatening the Papal States. He died in 1861 before the complete unification of Italy, but by his patience and statesmanship he had achieved the main work. Only Rome and Venetia remained outside the Kingdom of Italy.

Victor Emmanuel became King of Piedmont on the abdication of Charles Albert in 1849. He was a strong believer in liberalism and constitutional government. He

did not scrap the reforms when Austria put pressure upon him, and offered asylum to the liberals who were oppressed in other parts of Italy. By his support to the national movement he made the Italians feel that the unity of the country was possible only under his leadership. He introduced all reforms to make his State the most progressive in Italy. The country was economically and industrially developed, and an efficient army was organised. He gave full support to the programme of Cavour. In the war of Italian Independence in 1859 he was elected Dictator and placed at the head of the Army. When Napoleon negotiated terms of armistice at Villafranca without reference to him. Cavour was irritated but Victor Emmanuel maintained his temper and bore the affront unruffled. By his patience he won the admiration of all parties. People looked up to him as the real leader when the chances of a Republic disappeared.

SCHLESWIG-HOLSTEIN.

Q. 33. Give a brief history of the Schleswig-Holstein Question. How was the question finally settled? Estimate the importance of the solution to Germany. (P. U. 1928)

The duchies of Schleswig and Holstein were attached to Denmark for centuries together. The Duke of Schleswig-Holstein became the King of Denmark by hereditary right, but the duchies maintained their separate Government. The population of Holstein was mainly German, and in Schleswig half the population was German, Holstein was a member of the German Confederation, but not Schleswig. The King of Denmark under the influence of the Eider-Dane party wanted to incorporate the duchies into Denmark, but the German population protested. The question was settled by the Treaty of London in 1852, by which the Duchies were promised separate representative bodies, but would be included in a common constitution of the whole monarchy, subject to the approval of the Estates. The position of Holstein as a member of the German Confederation was not touched. But the treaty was not approved of by the Diet of Frankfort nor by the Eider-Dane Party in Denmark.

In 1855 a revised constitution was introduced by which the Duchies were merged in the monarchy without any special rights as separate entities. By a royal charter Schleswig was absorbed in the Danish Kingdom in March 1863, and although Holstein still maintained its independent position it was exploited financially in the interest of the whole State. This involved a two-fold infringement of the Treaty, first Holstein was not consulted in the matter, and second the rights of the German Confederation were disregarded. Besides the two Duchies there was the question of succession to the throne as King Frederick VII was childless. The Treaty of London had mentioned Prince Christian of Glucksburg, who had married his niece, as his successor. These questions were taken up by the Diet at Frankfort and it urged Denmark to withdraw the March Charter, and to put in force the provisions of the Treaty of 1852. In the matter of succession it supported the claims of Frederick, Duke of Augustenburg. The Danish Government refused to modify their arrangements and would not accept any compromise. The Diet then resolved to take action (October 1, 1863), but neither Prussia nor Austria was inclined to force an immediate rupture.

The matter became complicated when King Frederick VII died on November 15, 1863. Prince Christian of Glucksburg ascended the throne of Denmark, but the assemblies of the Duchies announced their separation from Denmark, and proclaimed Frederick, Duke of Augustenburg as their ruler. The new King of Denmark put the draft constitution in force in violation of the London Treaty, and in opposition to the wishes of the German subjects and the German Confederation. The question then became a national issue. At a Conference of the members of the State legislatures in December, it was resolved to send a federal army of execution to Holstein. There was difference of opinion among the Germans; Bismarck wanted to make the London Protocol and the resolution of the Confederation as the starting point. This was also the view of the Austrian minister Rechberg. The Governments of Prussia and Austria would acknowledge Christian as the

King of Denmark provided he conceded autonomy to the Duchies but the Governments of the other States and the liberals of Prussia and Austria pressed the claims of Frederick of Augustenburg. The federal action started in December, 1863, when the Hanoverian and Saxon troops occupied Holstein without opposition. The Danes retired to Schleswig. Bismarck considered the federal action in excess of the requirements and decided to act independently in conjunction with Austria.

1 The two Powers sent an ultimatum on January 16, 1864, demanding repeal of the new constitution, and on the refusal of Denmark declared war. A joint army of Austria and Prussia was sent into the Danish territory. The Danes were defeated in several engagements, lost Jutland, and their Duppel entrenchments were stormed. England called a Conference of the Powers to London, and arranged a truce (April 25). The terms of settlement were so couched by Bismarck that Denmark refused them. He demanded the union of Schleswig and Denmark as an independent State under the suzerainty of the King of Denmark, and the admission of Schleswig to the German Confederation. The Danes lost the sympathy of the Powers for refusing these terms. The Conference broke up on June 25. The military operations of the joint army were resumed. The Danish Government was forced to capitulate and by a preliminary treaty agreed to part with Schleswig, Holstein and Lauenberg. The final treaty was signed at Vienna on October 1. The Duchies were freed from Danish encroachments, but their future remained obscure.

"The question of the government of the Duchies created many complications. Bismarck was willing to admit the claims of Frederick, Duke of Augustenburg provided he placed the army and finances under Prussian control. This the Duke refused, and then as a sort of compromise Bismarck entered into an understanding with Austria in what is known as the Convention of Gastein (August 14, 1865). Austria was given the right to carry on the

administration of Holstein and Prussia of Schleswig. Lauenberg was made over to Prussia on payment of 2¹ million Thalers. The Conference of the delegates of the State Legislatures in Germany assembled at Frankfurt protested against this arrangement as a "violation of right". The people of the Duchies were encouraged to express their disapproval of the distribution of the territories without consultation. Evidence was found that the Austrian Governor of Holstein encouraged anti-Prussian agitation in Schleswig. A protest from Prussia was unheeded by Austria. This afforded an opportunity to Bismarck to declare war against Austria. He obtained the neutrality of Napoleon III, and made an alliance with Italy.

Prussia sent her troops into Holstein on the plea of the breach of the Convention of Gastein by Austria. Bismarck proclaimed that the joint administration of the Duchies as before the Convention would now be restored. He asked Austria to send troops into Schleswig as Prussia had done in Holstein. As a protest against this step the Austrian Governor retired to Hanover (June, 7). The dispute was carried to the Diet at Frankfurt, and the mobilisation of the Federal troops against Prussia breach of the treaty of Vienna and the Gastein Convention demanded (June, 11). Prussia urged that federal action would be unconstitutional, declared the Confederation dissolved and withdrew from it. This precipitated the war. The German States were divided into two camps. The war was fought in several zones. The defeat of the Austrians at Sadowa on July 3, brought the war to a close. Austria was brought to bay and agreed to terms. The final terms were settled in the Treaty of Prague (August 23, 1866). Schleswig, Holstein and Lauenberg came into the possession of Prussia. This was the final settlement of the Schleswig-Holstein question.

The solution drove Austria from Germany and made Prussia predominant. A new North German Confederation was formed under the presidency of Prussia. Prussia

expanded her territories and now had a consolidated kingdom with a population of 25,000,000.

THE AUSTRO-PRUSSIAN WAR.

Q. 34. Give the cause of the Austro-Prussian war of 1866 How did Bismarck succeed in isolating Austria at the time of the war ? *(P. U. 1925.)*

Austria under the Hapsburgs had been enjoying the leadership of the German States for centuries together. The rise of the Hohenzollerns in Prussia in the nineteenth century brought a strong rival into the field. The ascendancy of Austria was bitterly resented by the Germans because she had been responsible for the suppression of all liberal movements. Besides the Austrian Empire consisted of a considerable portion of non-German population. The Prussians felt that they would not be able to remove Austria from this ascendancy unless Prussia became a strong military State. The leadership of Germany was offered to Prussia by the Frankfort Parliament during the Revolution of 1848 But King Frederick William IV was afraid of Austria, and did not venture to injure the dignity of the Emperor His son William I was a man of different type. He was a soldier and a statesman, and could detect capacity in others. As Regent during his father's illness he appointed Helmuth Karl Bernhard von Moltke as Chief of the General Staff, and Albert Theodor Emil Count Von Roon as Minister of War. Roon developed a scheme of improving the Prussian Army.

In the War of Italian Independence William I offered the services of the Prussian Army to Emperor Francis Joseph against France on condition that he himself should be placed at the head of the whole federal forces of Germany. The Emperor refused the offer, and William I considered the refusal as an attempt on the part of the Emperor to prevent Prussia from becoming more important in Germany. The personal and political relations of the two rulers were thus embittered, and the war dealt

a heavy blow at the prestige of Austria. King William therefore resolved to perfect his army scheme. In this matter he met with opposition from the Prussian Parliament. At this crisis he invited Bismarck to preside over the Ministry. The new minister fully sympathised with the ideas of his King, and had realised during his stay at Frankfort that Austria was the determined enemy of Prussia, and that future Germany must be an extension of Prussia. Austria must be driven out of Germany to make Prussia the leading Power, and this was possible only by means of war. With this object in view he began to cultivate the friendship of the minor sovereigns, to strengthen their economic ties with Prussia, and to adopt a more independent and bolder diplomacy in the wider European sphere. He advised the King to maintain the friendship with Russia, and during the Polish insurrection in 1863 he supported Russia. The Schleswig-Holstein question afforded an opportunity to pick up a quarrel with Austria. With the help of Austria the Danish rule was removed from the Duchies of Schleswig and Holstein. Austria was drawn into the plan of Bismarck against the wishes of the German Diet and the smaller States because she had a dread of German liberation. The Convention of Gastein was evidently a temporary measure. Austria supported the claims of Frederick, Duke of Augustenburg to the Duchies, this was not agreeable to Bismarck. He now began preparations for a war. He secured the friendship of Napoleon at an interview at Biarritz and through him entered into an alliance with Italy. He marched Prussian troops into Holstein on the ground that Austria was encouraging the people against Prussia by pressing the claims of Frederick. Austria withdrew from Holstein and appealed to the Diet at Frankfort. The Diet resolved to take action, upon this Prussia repudiated the Diet and declared war. (June 18, 1866). The Austro-Prussian war was thus caused by the rivalry between the two Powers for ascendancy in Germany, but the dispute over Schleswig-Holstein was merely an occasion for it.

Bismarck succeeded in isolating Austria first by

supporting Russia in the Polish troubles. While at Frankfurt he had realised that Russian friendship would be very useful to Prussia. Russia had her eyes towards the East, and her friendship could be won very readily. For this reason Prussia did not fight against Russia in the Crimean war, and offered help to Russia during the revolution in Poland. Assured of the friendship of Russia Bismarck tried to neutralise France. He met Napoleon at Biarritz for the purpose. The Emperor had recently suffered loss of prestige in the Mexican affairs and his position in France was not quite secure. Bismarck held out before him the chances of re-establishing his prestige at home and abroad, by an extension of the French territories, and by snatching Venice from Austrian control for Italy. With these assurances Napoleon promised French neutrality, and secured for Prussia the alliance with the Kingdom of Piedmont. In April 1866 Victor Emmanuel promised to declare war on Austria if war broke out between Prussia and Austria within the next three months. Bismarck did not care for England as the latter was not in a mood to fight with any body. The important European Powers were on the side of Prussia, and Austria was left alone. She only obtained help from the smaller States in Germany, but Prussia with her effective war organisation and better implements managed to defeat them all.

THE BATTLE OF SADOWA.

Q. 35. How far would you agree with the view that the battle of Sadowa was hardly less a defeat for Napoleon III than it was for Francis Joseph. (*P. U. 1926.*)

The battle of Sadowa was a surprise to Napoleon III. He was all along hoping that Prussia and Austria would be exhausted in the war, and that he would step in as the arbiter. That was the trend of the talk between him and Bismarck at Biarritz, and as an acknowledgment of his services he might be asked to accept some territories either the Rhine frontier or Luxemburg, or part of Belgium or Switzerland. But Bismarck was careful not to make any

definite promise. During the war when Prussian Army advanced into Bohemia Austria requested Napoleon to mediate, and placed Venice at his disposal. Napoleon however, could not do anything except promising diplomatic support. He expected a long war, but instead Austria was defeated at Sadowa and asked for terms. Napoleon was given no chance of mediation. His proposal of a Congress of the Powers on the eve of the war was not accepted by Austria, and now Prussia appeared as the dictator of the terms. Napoleon asked for "Compensation" from Prussia. The French Ambassador saw Bismarck to redeem his promise, and the astute politician after settling the terms of the treaty with Austria flatly refused to accede to the request of Napoleon. This was a great disappointment to the French Emperor. His declining prestige suffered a great blow, and Bismarck exploited his position of weakness in promoting the German Scheme. The Franco-Prussian war was a necessary corollary to this policy. The defeat of the Austrians at Sadowa was therefore disastrous to Napoleon.

Austria no doubt was driven out of Germany, and lost her ascendancy in the Empire. But Bismarck did not humiliate his neighbour. He was anxious to maintain the friendship of Austria, and therefore in the Treaty of Prague the integrity of Austria was maintained. The result was that Austria was not free to develop her Eastern policy. The loss of the presidency of the German Bund was no doubt humiliating, but the Austrian Empire as a whole did gain by concentrating its attention on its own problems at home. But France was exposed before the European Powers as a greedy interloper. Napoleon had already obtained Savoy and Nice, and tried to obtain some territory either at the expense of the German States or Belgium or Switzerland. The Southern States joined the North, and England became indignant. France was left alone in her crisis. Napoleon was taken a prisoner in the war, and lost his empire. The defeat of Sadowa therefore affected him more than Francis Joseph.

FRANCO-PRUSSIAN WAR.

Q. 36. Distinguish between the causes and the occasion of the Franco-Prussian war of 1870. (*P. U. 1921.*)

The occasion of the Franco-Prussian war was the dispute over the Spanish throne. The incompetent ruler Queen Isabella was deposed in 1868, and there was some difficulty in finding a successor to the throne. It was declined by many Princes to whom the offer was made. Bismarck procured the offer to Prince Leopold of Hohenzollern—Sigmaringen. After two refusals the Prince accepted it when offered the third time (July 4, 1870). But France protested as it was thought that the accession of a Hohenzollern to the throne of Spain would increase the Prussian influence. The attitude of the English Government was not encouraging, so Prince Leopold finally declined the offer (July 12). But the French Government was not satisfied. They decided to demand from Prussia a guarantee that the candidature would not be renewed. For this purpose the French Ambassador at Berlin, Count Beneditti was instructed to wait upon King William I. The interview took place at Ems on July 13. The reply given by the King was to the effect that since the Prince had declined the offer he had nothing further to add. The King refused to receive Beneditti again, and the purport of the interview was wired to Bismarck, who communicated it to the Press in his own language. The message was read in France as an insult to her Ambassador, and in Germany as rudeness to the Prussian King. In France the Cabinet under the influence of the Empress, and the Foreign Minister Gramont decided upon war.

Bismarck was assiduously preparing this situation. The actual causes of conflict were very remote. Black clouds were gathering on the horizon since the battle of Sadowa. Bismarck was seeking an opportunity of drawing the Southern States of Germany to union with the North. He was bent upon achieving the unity of Germany, and found the particularist tendencies of the Southern States very strong. Bismarck had refused the request of Napoleon

for some territories on the banks of the Rhine, but by a clever trick had obtained a written draft on the subject. This was the famous *Projet de Traité* which was published by Bismarck on July 25, 1870. France would recognise the federation of the German States, and in return would be allowed to purchase Luxemburg from Holland. In case there was war with Belgium or any other Power then Germany would help France. This created a great indignation against France. The proposal of the purchase of Luxemburg was opposed by the Germans although the King of Holland was willing. Possibly Bismarck had no objection to Napoleon getting a slice out of Belgium, provided that helped his scheme of the unification of Germany. The failure of Napoleon to extend the boundaries of France created great disappointment and there was a strong spirit in favour of war.

There was some difference of opinion regarding the admission of the Southern States into the North German Confederation. Both Austria and France considered this as an infringement of the Treaty of Prague. The Austrian Archduke Albert who visited Paris about this time suggested an invasion into South Germany in conjunction with Italy and Austria. But it was found that Austria was not prepared to declare war. The war spirit however remained unabated. The "Chauvinists" in France as much as the "Jingoes" in Germany fanned the flame of hatred by their wild pretensions of superiority in race and culture. This war spirit was set ablaze by the dispute over the Spanish question. Napoleon was anxious to redeem his lost prestige by another war, whereas Bismarck's policy was guided by the one aim of unifying Germany. The ambitions of Napoleon for territorial expansion were enough to drive the Southern States into the arms of Bismarck.

UNIFICATION OF GERMANY

Q. 37. How did Bismarck achieve the unity of Germany? What steps had already been taken in that direction between 1815 and 1862 (P U 1918).

Q. 38. Give with the aid of a map, the various stages by which the unification of Germany or unity of Italy, was attained. (P. I. 1921).

Q. 39. Carefully outline the main events in the unification of Germany under Bismarck, and estimate the importance of his influence upon European affairs. (P. I. 1930)

(N. B. The unity of Italy has been discussed in question No. 30).

Unification of Germany.—Germany consisted of 300 States in 1789, and Napoleon reduced them to 38. There was a growing spirit of nationalism among the Germans and after the defeat of the Prussians at Jena they felt greatly humiliated, and resolved to bring about a reconstruction of their national life. On account of the opposition of Austria the German States failed to achieve a closer union which the people so passionately desired. A closely knit Federal Germany would not tolerate the ascendancy of Austria which included a majority of non-German population. Prussia was gradually growing in importance, and would as a natural corollary displace Austria in the leadership of Germany. So it was the policy of Austria to make the Confederation as soon as possible. This also pleased the Princes who retained their absolute authority. The only common bond was the Federal Diet meeting at Frankfort. It consisted of diplomats representing Governments and there was no popular representation on it. Besides it could not make any progress as no decision could be taken except by the unanimous consent of the whole body.

Although the Vienna Congress disappointed the Germans, they entertained the hope of unity and kept alive their dream through song, literature and international activities. The period between 1815 and 1848 was barren of political results. In this period Austria guided the policy of the German States, and crushed all the liberal movements. Prussia began to set her house in order and undertook reforms in trade and commerce. The first step towards the unification of Germany was the organisation of the

Zollverein (Customs Union) in 1833, which was joined by most of the States. Prussia was at the head of this Union. The combination of the States in regulating their trade and commerce taught them to seek unity in political matters as well. Austria was excluded from this Union, as her economic policy was different.

The French Revolution of 1848 produced a strong upheaval in Germany. The representatives of the people met in a National Assembly at Frankfort, which after long deliberations offered the leadership of Germany to Prussia, and included in the Federation the German speaking part of the Austrian Empire. King Frederick William IV of Prussia declined to accept the Crown from the people, and was afraid of irritating the traditional leader, the Emperor of Austria. He however could not stem the tide of democracy, summoned the Landtag to frame a constitution for the country, and granted a new constitution to Prussia, and thereby tried to retain the popularity. Although he declined to accept the leadership of Germany offered to him by the Frankfort Parliament, he promoted a movement for union among the Princes. A League of the North was organised for the purpose. But this movement collapsed under pressure from Austria. King of Prussia had to carry out a policy of disarmament and to dissolve the League of the North after his interview with the Austrian minister, Schwarzenburg at Olmutz (November 28, 1850). The humiliation went deep into the hearts of the King and people of Prussia.

William I as Regent of Prussia during the illness of his brother Frederick William IV had offered to command the German forces against France in 1859, but Francis Joseph did not accept the offer. It was felt in Prussia that Austria was the greatest enemy of Prussia, and that the unity of Germany was not possible so long as Austria retained her ascendancy. This again could be achieved through war. So William I launched a scheme of effective army organisation. This was opposed by the Prussian Parliament, and the King was advised to invite Bismarck

who was then at Paris to lead the Government. This new minister shared the views of the King. It was his experience at Frankfort that led him to believe that Austria must be driven out of Germany to make Prussia the leading Power, and that this was possible only by means of war. "The unity of Germany is to be brought about, not by speeches nor by votes of majorities, but by blood and iron" as he once said. In opposition to public opinion, and sometime to the King, he developed his plan of unifying Germany. He wanted to achieve this not by merging Prussia into Germany, rather by expanding Prussia into Germany. He fully accepted the ideals of the Liberals regarding national unity and constitutional government but they differed with regard to the method. In the matter of the Army reforms the Parliament remained obstinate, and Bismarck carried on the Government without a budget.

Next to the Army Reforms his foreign policy was also not in keeping with the spirit of the people. He supported the autocratic Russia against the Poles. But the opposition of the King and the Parliament gradually relaxed when Bismarck's National policy unfolded itself. His object of unifying Germany was accomplished by three wars, *viz*

- (1) War of Austria and Prussia against Denmark (1864)
- (2) The Austro-Prussian War (1866) and
- (3) The Franco-Prussian War (1870-71)

The Schleswig-Holstein question afforded occasion for the first two wars. He won over Austria to cooperate with Prussia in the war against Denmark. The two countries took up the cause of the German subjects of the Duchies of Schleswig and Holstein against the policy of absorption of the Danish Government, and by inflicting a series of defeats forced Denmark to cede Schleswig, Holstein and Lauenburg. But the trouble with Austria arose over the administration of the two Duchies. The German sentiment was in favour of making them over to Frederick, Duke of Agsteinburg, Bismarck felt that the

Duke would be dependent upon Austria, and so he wanted that he should place his army and finance under Prussian control. This Frederick was not willing to do so Bismarck first arranged with Austria by the Convention of Gastein to keep Schleswig for Prussia, and let Austria manage Holstein. But the movement in favour of Frederick was encouraged by Austria. The Convention was therefore scrapped, and Bismarck wanted to restore the joint Government. The result was the Austro-Prussian War. He had already procured the neutrality of Napoleon, and the consent of Italy to declare war against Austria. The battle of Sadowa (Königgratz) ended the Seven Weeks' War. The Treaty of Prague made Austria withdraw from Germany, and to transfer her rights over Schleswig-Holstein to Prussia. Hanover, Hesse-Cassel, Nassau and Frankfurt were annexed by Prussia. The old German Bund was dissolved, and the North German Confederation formed with Prussia at the head. This is a big step towards German unity, only a few States of the south remained outside the union. These States although outside the political union were included in the Zollverein and placed the management of the economic affairs in the hands of the legislature of the North German Confederation, and cooperation in commerce and trade led to the realisation of unity in political life.

The final stage was reached in the Franco-Prussian war. Napoleon III precipitated the conflict with Prussia by his territorial ambitions, and subsequently making unreasonable demands in the matter of the Spanish succession. The Southern States were threatened by France, and they were persuaded by Bismarck to join the North in self-defence. The fall of Napoleon at Sedan made the Southern States agree to the proposal of unity. The Confederation was changed into *Reich* (Empire) with the King of Prussia as the Emperor. The particularist views of the States were maintained in the new constitution, by the provision that the smaller States would outvote Prussia in the Bundesrath, and any amendment to the constitution could

be vetoed by fourteen votes. But in fact the King of Prussia as Emperor obtained full control over the Army and Foreign Affairs, and exercised complete control over the Empire.

Bismarck achieved this unity by his policy of "blood and iron". He carried on the Army Reforms in the face of opposition, drove Austria out of Germany, and drew the German states into Union under the leadership of Prussia.

INFLUENCE OF BISMARCK UPON EUROPEAN AFFAIRS

Before the attainment of German unity Bismarck maintained friendship with Russia, secured the neutrality of France, and managed to obtain cooperation with Italy against Austria. After driving Austria out of Germany he began to cultivate good-will towards Austria, and tried to humiliate Napoleon. This policy created the spirit of rivalry between France and Germany, and the subsequent history of Europe was moulded very greatly by this spirit.

There were combinations and counter-combinations formed, and the Great War of 1914-18 was a necessary corollary of this policy. So long as Bismarck was in power, he tried to maintain the Balance of Power. But Germany drifted into a new policy since he was removed from his position as Chancellor. For a quarter of a century he was the most outstanding figure in Europe. In the Russo-Turkish war he appeared as a peace-maker. After the attainment of the unity of Germany he devoted his attention to social and economic problems of his people.

GROWTH OF PRUSSIA

Q. 40. Trace the main steps in the history of Prussia in the nineteenth century. (P. U. 1926).

Q. 41. Sketch the measures which led to the revival of Prussia after the downfall of 1806. (P. U. 1916).

The defeat of the Prussians at the battle of Jena in 1806 and the domination of Napoleon stirred the people to a new consciousness of national self-respect. Prussia till

then was following the old type of Government, feudal system, and mercenary troops. The patriots felt the necessity of some radical changes by which the State and people might be placed in organic relation, and that the people might take a real interest in the success of the Government. With this object in view the Army was thoroughly reformed, and the political and social life reorganised. Through the efforts of Scharnhorst, Gneisenau, and Clausewitz the Army became national, and the foreigners were excluded. The system of privilege was removed and a new standard of military honour was introduced. Napoleon had laid down that the Army should not exceed 42,000, but by a short service system the universal military service was enforced. These reforms in the Army led Prussia to success in 1814, 1866, and 1870.

Through the efforts of Stein and Hardenberg the serfdom was abolished in 1810, and the peasants henceforth became owners of their lands. The barriers between the towns and the country in the movement of trade was removed. The education received a great impetus. At the instance of Von Humbolt the University of Berlin was founded. The literature also showed a new life. The writings of Fichte and Schiller turned into the new channel of nationalism. The new spirit of patriotism thus awakened led to an alliance between Prussia and Russia (1813), brought about the defeat of Napoleon at Leipzig, known as the "Battle of the Nations".

At the Congress of Vienna Prussia became the largest German State by receiving Poson, Danzig, Pomerania, Neuchatel and the Grand Duchy of the Lower Rhine with Westphalia and the greater part of Saxony. These acquisitions also improved the economic and political life of Prussia. The Prussian King Frederick William III fell under the influence of Metternich and carried out his reactionary measures against the German liberal movement. But Prussia initiated a movement for the union of the German States in trade and commerce. Economically Germany was in a backward condition, and there were

divergent tariff systems in the different States. Prussia passed a law in 1818 by which she combined with other States in forming a Customs Union (Zollverein). By 1834 seventeen States joined the Union. The member States allowed goods to pass freely from one State to another and they maintained a common tariff frontier against outsiders. The revenues were shared *pro rata* according to population. In the beginning some of the southern States such as Bavaria, Wurtemberg and others did not join. But most of them were persuaded to combine in their own interests. The commercial unity helped the Germans to realise the value of political unity. Austria was ill at ease at the leadership of Prussia in commercial matters, but failed to do any harm. The tariff policy in the beginning was determined by the teachings of Adam Smith. But the publication of *The Natural System of Political Economy* in 1841 brought about a change. List urged protection, "On the development of the German protective system depend the existence, the independence, and the future of German nationality". He was an ardent nationalist and a convinced protectionist. There was great controversy after the publication of his book, and finally his principles were adopted in Germany.

Besides extending her influence in commerce Prussia wanted the leadership in military and political affairs. The King of Prussia was not given the command of the troops of the North German States. Frederick William III who died in 1840 was a weak man and was afraid of Metternich. His wisdom lay in the practice of leaving every thing into the hands of his advisers. His successor Frederick William IV was a very intelligent man. His reign was marked by a number of liberal measures, such as the release of the imprisoned patriots, and the restoration of the Professors to their posts. He allowed the Provincial Estates to meet regularly and enlarged the freedom of the Press. But he was not in favour of a parliamentary constitution. He summoned a meeting of the United Landtag in February, 1847, and it was dismissed after a brief session. The King was not

prepared to hold its meeting at regular intervals, and it was to transact business as the King would desire. This did not satisfy the popular sentiment.

During the Revolution of 1848 the German National Convention at Frankfort offered the Crown of the German Empire to the King of Prussia. But Frederick William IV refused to accept it at the hands of the people. He, however, tried to organise a League of the North to obtain leadership with the help of the Princes. This had to be dissolved under threat from Austria. The political aspirations of Prussia were thus shattered. But the King tried to win popular sympathy by granting a constitution to Prussia in 1850. This constitution was in force till the downfall of the German Empire in 1918. A Parliament of two chambers elected by universal suffrage was created. The voters were divided into three classes according to the amount of tax they paid. The Austrian Minister Schwarzenburg urged the King in vain to repeal the new constitution. Austria thus received a rebuff. The new constitution, however, fell into the hands of the "Junkers" who were reactionaries, and restored the powers of the old privileged classes.

Frederick William IV became incapable of business on account of an attack of mental malady in 1857, and his brother William acted as Regent till his death in 1862. William was an enthusiast in Army affairs and called Otto Von Bismarck to lead the Government, when he received a rebuff from Parliament in his Army reform measures in 1862. Bismarck made Prussia the leader of Germany, and united it into an Empire under the King of Prussia. With the help of Austria he snatched Schleswig and Holstein from Denmark in 1864, and picking up a quarrel over the administration of the Duchies he defeated Austria, acquired the two Duchies, and some smaller States of Germany for Prussia and drove Austria from Germany (1866). The old German Confederation was abolished, and the North German Confederation under the leadership of Prussia

was formed. In the Franco-Prussian war the Southern States were forced to join the North, and after the fall of Napoleon, the new German Empire was created. Thus Prussia has become Germany. In the constitution of the Empire Prussia enjoyed not only the presidency, but with 17 votes in the Bundesrat it could veto any measure. The Hohenzollern Kings ruled Germany till 1918.

FALL OF THE SECOND FRENCH EMPIRE AND NAPOLEON III.

Q. 42. Trace the origin, growth and collapse of the second French Empire under Napoleon III. (*P. U. 1930*)

Q. 43. "Even without the military disasters of 1870, the collapse of the second Empire could not have been delayed." Discuss this statement and account for the power of Napoleon III in France and for the downfall of his dynasty. (*P. U. 1917*).

Q. 44. Account for the fall of Napoleon III. (*P. U. 1925*).

ORIGIN OF THE SECOND EMPIRE.

The Revolution of 1848 made France a Republic. The new constitution provided for the election of a President for four years. Louis Napoleon, nephew of Napoleon Bonaparte, was elected the first President. He started a good programme of development which required a longer period than the term of his office allowed. But he failed to get the constitution revised. By a *coup d'etat* on December 2, 1851, he dissolved the Assembly, and asked the people to vote a new constitution by which the term of office of the President was extended to ten years. He then began to canvass public opinion in favour of re-establishing the Empire, and persuaded the Senate to proclaim him as Emperor of the French under the title of Napoleon III. The transformation of the Republic into an Empire was so easy because France required a strong man to guide the affairs of State. The propertied class was afraid of

socialism, and working men had no faith in the middle class. The vast majority of votes in favour of the change indicates that Napoleon was very popular. The parliamentary form of Government was not fully appreciated by the common people. They felt the necessity of personal touch which Napoleon promised to supply. People expected that Louis Napoleon would follow in the footsteps of his great ancestor, and would bring prosperity at home and glory abroad. Thus originated the Second Empire under Napoleon III.

The Government of Napoleon as Emperor may be divided into two periods: *viz* (a) The Absolutist Empire (1852—67) and (b) Liberal Empire (1867—70).

In the first period the political life of France was in its lowest. Although there was a representative Chamber it enjoyed illusory powers, and the elections were held under the guidance of the State officials. The Chamber could not elect its own president nor to propose a bill at its own initiative. The public could be excluded from the visitors' gallery by a vote of only five members. The rights of the Press were restricted, and press offences could be tried by tribunals of summary jurisdiction. Education was strictly controlled, and there was a regular system of espionage. The autocratic rule was, however, made acceptable by a number of benevolent measures. Napoleon did his best to keep the people contented by promoting their material welfare. Big public works were undertaken to give employment to the working men and the industrial classes, and banks and agricultural societies were started. Rail roads were constructed, steamer service was established with America and Asia. Postage was reduced and telegraph lines extended. International exhibitions were held to stimulate trade and commerce in 1855, and 1867. Along with the growth of prosperity Napoleon brought glory from abroad. During the Crimean War he won for France the position of the guardian of Europe. In the Italian War of Independence

he stood as the champion of nationalism. But his influence began to decline when he tried to employ his position in the interest of France. The annexation of Savoy and Nice roused up feelings of discontent in Italy, and England also became indignant. By the Villafranca armistice he alienated the Italians. His Italian policy also offended the Catholic Party for the weakening of the powers of the Pope. On the other hand he could not satisfy the liberals by trying to support the Pope. His activities in Mexico brought disgrace upon him, and the cup of his misery was full with the defeat of Austria at Sadowa. His extravagant wars cost France heavily and there were several forces at work to reduce his authority.

In the second period of his rule Napoleon therefore tried to win over the liberal party by some concessions. He had already given the working men the right to form unions. Under pressure from the liberals he now extended the privileges of the Chamber, relaxed the Press laws and allowed the citizens to hold public meetings on the responsibility of seven persons. Gradually a real parliamentary system was developed. The liberal empire thus inaugurated was destroyed by the Franco-Prussian War.

Collapse of the Empire. Napoleon had brought disaster upon the Empire by his indiscreet foreign policy. He had alienated the Italians by his vacillating policy. He promoted the cause of Italian unity by joining in the war of Independence, but when Italy was on the way to success he deserted her for fear of Austria and Prussia. By encouraging Prince Maximilian of Austria to go to Mexico, and then forsaking him when he wanted his help he lost the sympathies of Austria. In the Austro-Prussian War he did not follow a straight policy. He remained neutral to win some advantage for France. Bismarck was more than a match for him, and outwitted him in every respect. His request for compensation was used against him, to make the Southern States of

Germany join the North Confederation. The dispute over the succession to the Spanish throne afforded an opportunity of provoking France to declare war for which France was not really ready. Napoleon was suffering from a chronic disease. He had lost the vigour of health as well as of mind. He could not control the war spirit in France. In the war he was captured, and Paris invested. The Republican party carried on the war for some time. A National Assembly was elected after the fall of Paris. It consisted of a large number of Republicans who formed a compact party. The Assembly deposed Napoleon who was considered to be responsible for the ruin of France.

CAUSES OF THE FALL OF NAPOLEON III.

The Second Empire had within it the inherent causes of weakness. Napoleon had promised to maintain the constitution of 1848, but he had overthrown it by his two *coup d' etats*. His new powers he had utilised in re-establishing the autocracy. The Republicans were therefore strongly opposed to him. The Legitimists and the Orleanists were not reconciled to him. He also failed to please the Catholic party by his manœuvres in Italy. In the trial of Delescluze the strength of the Republican sentiment in France was made evident. The defence speech of Gambetta created a sensation. Napoleon saw the weakness of his position and had to yield to the political reforms demanded by the liberals. His fall was accelerated by the Franco-Prussian war, otherwise the growth of the Republican movement would have brought about a catastrophe in due course.

THE THIRD REPUBLIC

Q. 45. Trace the chief steps in the establishment of the Third Republic in France; and consider whether it has been strengthened or weakened by its ecclesiastical policy. (P. U. 1918).

France was faced with a civil war on the surrender of Napoleon at Sedan. The citizens of Paris at once

proclaimed the Republic, but in view of the crisis which was threatening France all the parties agreed to the Government of the National Defence. The Napoleonic Empire ceased to exist, but the consideration of the future constitution was postponed till the return of peace. The citizens of Paris who were mostly republicans got exasperated, and tried to set up the Rule of the Commune everywhere in France. They organised a "Republican Federation of the National Guard" which defied the Government of the Assembly which had established itself at Versailles. This involved France in a Civil War which went on for six weeks. Ultimately the Assembly under the leadership of M. Thiers succeeded in crushing the Communards by the 28th May, 1871.

Then followed a struggle in the Assembly between the Monarchists and the Republicans. M. Thiers had his predilections for a constitutional monarchy, but kept the question open till the other pressing problems were solved. By his able management he paid off the last instalment of the indemnity by March, 1873, and by the autumn the German soldiers evacuated the French territory. On the settlement of this problem the constitutional question was taken up. The National Assembly was predominantly monarchist. An attempt was made to restore the Empire but Napoleon was dead, and there were only two possible candidates for the throne, the Comte de Paris of the Orleanist family, and the Comte de Chambord of the Bourbon House. M. Thiers realised the logic of circumstances and felt that the restoration of the Monarchy was impossible in view of the feelings of the people. The Assembly passed a Resolution against his policy and as it was interpreted as a vote of no confidence M. Thiers resigned. Marshal MacMahon was elected to the Presidency in his place. The Comte de Chambord visited Paris in order to create some enthusiasm in his favour, but Paris gave him a cold shoulder and even MacMahon did not pay him a visit. He returned disappointed. The Assembly appointed a Commission to draft the Constitution, and on the 30th January, 1875, the Republic

was established by a majority of only one vote. The new constitution is a compromise between the autocratic and democratic principles of Government. The Legislature consists of two houses, the Chamber of Deputies elected for four years by manhood suffrage, and the Senate elected for nine years by special electoral colleges. The President is elected for seven years at a joint meeting of the Chamber of Deputies and the Senate. This system of Government has endured since then, although the ministries in France have not been very stable. The popular control is ensured by the system of responsible ministry. The President has no veto, but can return measures for reconsideration.

The Republic was confronted for some time by the attitude of the Ecclesiastical Party, which did not accept the Republic. The Republicans on the other hand believed in the thorough secularisation of the State, and they tried to reduce the powers of the Church and wanted that clergy should not in any way oppose the acts and principles of the Republic. With this object in view many measures were passed between 1881 and 1903. Schools were made undenominational, clergymen were not allowed to teach in them, prayers in the beginning of a parliamentary session were abolished, hospitals were made secular, and divorce law was restored. The Pope advised the clergy to accept the Republic in 1893. The tendencies in France were to separate the Church from the State, and to make the State entirely neutral towards all creeds and churches. The Pope did not like the visit of President Loubet to Victor Emmanuel III in Rome in 1904, and sent a protest to the Christian Powers of Europe. The French people considered this as an impertinent interference. By a law in 1905 the concordat of 1807 was abrogated, and a complete separation between the Church and the State was effected. The State ceased to pay the salaries of the clergymen, and the Church was given complete right to enjoy its property under the control of the "Associations of Worship". The Pope condemned this measure as an absolutely false thesis. So the French Parliament revised it by a new measure in 1907.

The "Associations of Worship." have been withdrawn, and Church now enjoys complete freedom from the State. This separation movement at times involved the Republic in danger. The spirit of opposition to the Republic was evident in the famous Dreyfus case, and the Clerical Party carried on a propaganda against the Government in this crisis. The Republic has however withstood all these onslaughts and has established itself in France.

TURKEY IN EUROPE

Q. 46. Estimate and account for the influence of "Turkey in Europe" during the second half of the nineteenth century. (*P. U. 1931*).

The ambitions of Russia towards the Ottoman Empire brought the Powers into conflict in the Near East. Turkey had her territories extended upto the borders of Hungary. But the nationalist movement had liberated Greece, Serbia, and the Principalities of Wallachia and Moldavia obtained autonomy under the suzerainty of the Sultan of Turkey. The dispute over the right to protect the Christian subjects of the Sultan caused the Crimean war. The attitude of England and France saved Turkey, and ensured her complete independence. But the promises made by the Sultan to improve the system of Government and to improve the condition of his subjects were not fulfilled. This created fresh unrest. A disturbance between the Christians and Musalmans took place in 1860 in the Mount Lebanon area in Syria. Napoleon III with the support of England occupied part of Syria and appointed a Christian Government in Syria. Another disturbance took place in Crete and the Sultan had to concede local autonomy to the island.

The most serious movement which threatened the Empire was the Slav movement. Since the Crimean war the Tsar of Russia was encouraging the Slavs to unite. He defended Montenegro against the Sultan, and helped Moldavia and Wallachia to unite in Roumania. The Roumanians, Serbs, and Bulgars were anxious to throw off

the control of the Sultan. The trouble started in Herzegovina where the crops had failed in 1874 and the taxes had not been remitted by the Porte. Unable to bear any more the tyranny of the Turks, the Jugo-Slavs revolted in July 1875. Sympathetic movements started in Serbia, Montenegro and Bulgaria. The Slavs appealed to the Powers for help. They asked that they should be allowed to migrate to some Christian State, or should be granted autonomy under a foreign Christian Prince, or their country should be occupied temporarily by some foreign troops. The risings caused alarm in the foreign courts. The Austrian minister Count Andrassy, in consultation with Prince Bismarck of Germany, and Prince Gorchakoff of Russia drew up a Note for presentation to the Porte. England then under Disraeli was not prepared to put pressure upon the Sultan who in the meantime had promised some reforms. But the nationalists had no faith in these promises, so the note was presented on January 31, 1876. The Porte accepted it with the exception of a mixed commission to supervise the execution of the reforms. This did not satisfy the Christian population, and the struggle continued. The Slavs were preparing for a national war, and the Musalmans tried to retaliate. The French and German Consuls were murdered on May 6; this created a spirit of indignation throughout Europe. The Chancellors of the three Eastern Empires drafted the Berlin Memorandum (May 13), France and Italy gave their consent to this step, but Disraeli refused to join them. The idea of putting pressure upon the Sultan by the Concert of Europe thus failed. The British Government not only did not join the Powers but ordered the British Fleet in the Mediterranean to proceed to the Besika Bay in case of any European complications. The British attitude made the situation worse. A few Turkish Officials had been murdered at Tatar Bazardjik, and as a reprisal the Turks destroyed more than 60 villages, and massacred about 12,000 persons, men, women and children. Disraeli ignored the reports as "Coffee-house babble." But when the facts were revealed Gladstone in his famous pamphlet on "The Bulgarian

Horrors and the Question of the East" exposed the policy of the Government, and asked the Turks to clear out of the Provinces with their "bag and baggage"

The atrocities in Bulgaria, and the failure of the Porte to introduce any reforms brought about the Russo-Turkish war. After a protracted war the Russians crossed the Balkans and reached Adrianople. The Sultan then sued for peace, January 31, 1878. The terms were settled at San Stefano. By this treaty Roumania, Serbia and Montenegro became independent States. Bulgaria was created into an autonomous State under the suzerainty of the Sultan, Bosnia and Herzegovina would have a Christian Governor, Russia would get Dobrudja which would be given to Roumania in exchange for Bessarabia and the Turkish fortresses on the Danube would be destroyed. The Powers were angry at the settlement of the terms without reference to them. They specially did not like the creation of Bulgaria where Russian influence was likely to increase. Roumania also was not agreeable to the Dobrudja-Bessarabia exchange. The attitude of the Powers led to the Congress of Berlin where the treaty of San Stefano was revised. The new terms were embodied in the Treaty of Berlin. Instead of a big Bulgaria there were three provinces. Bulgaria proper was made an autonomous State under the suzerainty of Turkey. Eastern Rumelia was made a self-governing province under a Christian Governor, and Macedonia remained a Turkish province. Independence of Serbia and Roumania was recognised, but Bosnia and Herzegovina were to be occupied by Austria indefinitely. The Greeks did not get their boundaries extended, the Bulgars were not happy at the division of their country, and there were many other problems in the Balkan area. The Treaty of Berlin did not produce the peace that was expected. The Near East still remained a danger zone.

The Bulgars felt humiliated in the way they had been treated. A rebellion took place in Eastern Rumelia in 1885, and Prince Alexander of Bulgaria brought about the union of two parts. Serbia declared war as she did not

like the establishment of a strong kingdom in her neighbourhood. The independence of Bulgaria was formally recognised in 1896. A similar rising took place in Crete in 1886, which was finally united to Greece in 1905.

The influence of Turkey in Europe was thus gradually reduced, and it was limited only to Constantinople. On account of the growth of national spirit among the Christian races in the Ottoman Empire, and the rivalry of the Powers in the Balkan area the Near East remained a storm centre of European politics for about a century. The main causes of unrest since the middle of the nineteenth century were: (1) the misgovernment of the Turks, (2) the rivalry of Great Britain and Russia at Constantinople, (3) ambitions of Austria to extend towards Salonica, and of Russia to occupy Constantinople, (4) the aspiration of the Balkan races to get their boundaries extended. The Christian Powers no doubt sympathised with the Christian subjects of the Sultan, but the main problem was extension of their influence by the different Powers in the dominion of the Sultan in Europe. The Christian States could not agree with the Moslem Power in all matters of State, and Russia was bent upon driving the "sick man" out of Europe. England stood by Turkey out of a desire to keep the Eastern route safe and not to allow Russia who was her rival in Asia to come into the Mediterranean. It is on account of this rivalry that Turkey still retains Constantinople. Germany tried to be friendly towards Turkey with a view to extend the German influence upto Baghdad, by building the Baghdad railway. The rivalry among the smaller States gave the other Powers an opportunity to interfere. The removal of the Turkish authority created a new situation in the Balkans. The occupation of Bosnia and Herzegovina by Austria was resented by the Slavs, and this brought about the crisis of 1914.

RUSSO-TURKISH WAR.

Q. 47. Write a survey of the history of Eastern Europe from 1875 to 1878, and elucidate the policies of England and

Russia in respect of the Balkan States during that period. (*P. U. 1926*).

Q 48. Account for the attitude of Disraeli towards Turkey. Whom would you hold responsible for the war between Russia and Turkey, 1877-78? (*P. U. 1921*).

After the Franco-Prussian war the European politics drifted towards the Near East. The defeat of France and the success of Germany who was an ally of Russia led the latter country to dream once more of promoting her interests in Turkey. The Tsar had lately discovered that the Slavs in the Ottoman Empire were in a rebellious mood. He thought he could increase the Russian influence in the Balkans by espousing the cause of the Slavs. The Turkish rule in the Balkans had not improved since the Crimean war, as the Sultan could count upon the friendship of England. So the subject Christian races began to take matters in their own hands. There was unrest in Serbia, Montenegro, Bosnia and Herzegovina. The subject peoples groaned under the oppressive rule, and to add to their difficulties the crops failed in Bosnia in 1874. They were not allowed any remission of taxes, and unable to bear any more the tyranny of the Turks the Jugo Slavs revolted in July 1875. A society had been formed in Russia to help the Slavs to overthrow the Turkish rule. Unrest was observed also in Serbia, Montenegro and Bulgaria. The peace of Europe was likely to be disturbed by the Eastern Question. The neighbouring Powers of Austria, Germany and Russia got frightened. The Austrian Minister Count Andrássy drew up a Note in consultation with Prince Bismarck and Prince Gorchakoff for presentation to Turkey. The Note expressed the anxiety of the Powers at the spread of the rebellion and to maintain the peace of Europe. It was desirable that the Sultan should be urged to grant complete religious liberty, to abolish tax-farming, and that the taxes should be applied to local needs. The condition of the peasantry should be improved, and to stop raise the execution of the reform. A mixed commission of Europeans and Muslims should be

appointed. The Note was presented on January 31, 1876. The Porte accepted the Note with the exception of the joint commission. This did not satisfy the nationalists. The unrest therefore increased in volume. The insurrections spread in Serbia and Montenegro, and Bulgaria. The Musalmans got excited and the German and French Counsuls at Salonika were murdered by a few fanatics on May 6. The situation becoming critical the Chancellors of those Eastern Empires met at Berlin and drew up the famous Berlin Memorandum in which they demanded an armistice for two months, the repatriation of Bosnian exiles and fugitives, and the removal of the Turkish troops from Bosnia. France and Italy gave their assent to the Note, but Disraeli refused to be a party to it. The attitude of Disraeli made any action on behalf of the Concert of Europe impossible.

The situation was now getting more serious. Serbia declared war on June 30, and Montenegro in July, 1876. In Bulgaria about a hundred officials had been murdered and in retaliation the Turkish soldiers had wiped out about 60 villages, and killed 12,000 persons. The Bulgar atrocities created a great indignation in Christian Europe. The affairs in Turkey had also taken a new turn. The Sultan Abdul Aziz was deposed on May 30, and the new Sultan Abdul Hamid who had been placed upon the throne by the *Young Turkey* party agreed to an armistice (August 31, 1876). The Serbians rejected the offer on account of the hard conditions. The Russians urged their Government to stand by the fellow-Slavs and to declare war against Turkey. The Tsar in order to avoid hostilities sent General Ignatieff to Constantinople to demand an immediate armistice. The ultimatum was delivered on October 30. The Porte yielded and Serbia was saved. The prospects of peace were however shattered by Disraeli who in his speech at Lord Mayor's Banquet on November 9, announced that England was ready to interfere on behalf of Turkey. Russia now made preparation for war. But before declaring war another attempt was made to settle the differences. A Conference

of the Powers met at Constantinople in December, and the Sultan promised to introduce reforms and did not desire to surrender his sovereign rights over his own subjects. The Conference therefore came to an abrupt end (January 20, 1877). The promised reforms never came forward, and Russia had no other alternative than to declare war (April 14). Before declaring war Russia sought the help of Germany and Austria. Germany refused to give any help either diplomatic or military, but Austria entered into a treaty to remain neutral. Roumania joined Russia, other Powers remained neutral. The attitude of England was inexplicable, although Russia took special care not to embroil her. She was assured that Russia would not interfere where the English interests were involved. Turkey was isolated. The war continued till January 31, 1878, when the Sultan on the arrival of the Russians at Adrianople, sued for peace. The terms were embodied in the treaty of San Stefano on March 3, 1878.

The Treaty recognised Roumania, Serbia and Montenegro as independent States, created Bulgaria an autonomous State, provided for a Christian Governor in Bosnia and Herzegovina and confined the Ottoman Empire in Europe to Constantinople. Russia was to get Dobrudja and some territories in Northern Armenia, in addition to a large indemnity. It was stipulated that Roumania would exchange Bessarabia for Dobrudja, and the Turkish fortresses on the Danube would be destroyed. The Powers were indignant at the publication of the terms of the Treaty. They did not like that the problem of the Near East would be settled without reference to them. The creation of Bulgaria where the Russian influence would predominate was specially resented. Roumania disliked the Dobrudja-Bessarabia exchange. The Porte had promised to carry out reforms in Bosnia and Herzegovina. On account of the interference of the Powers the terms of the Treaty were referred to the Congress of the Powers at Berlin. But before the discussions opened there Lord Salisbury had settled secret terms with Turkey and Russia separately. So the deliberations of the

Congress were short and the Treaty of San Stefano was modified by the Treaty of Berlin (July 13, 1878). The new treaty rescinded the provisions regarding Bulgaria, which was split up in three parts, Bulgaria proper being created into an autonomous State under Turkey, Eastern Rumelia was a selfgoverning province under a Christian Governor, and Macedonia to remain a Turkish province. Serbia gained some territory at the expense of Bulgaria. Montenegro and Serbia were recognised as independent States. Roumanian independence was recognised, but the arrangements regarding Bessarabia were not altered. Other provisions were practically unaltered. By this Treaty the position of the Balkan States were determined for thirty years, although Near East still remained a danger zone.

THE ATTITUDE OF ENGLAND AND RUSSIA.

Russia was from the beginning interested in the Slav movement. Besides the racial feelings she wanted to exploit the Balkan situation in her own favour. The Tsar believed that the Government of Turkey was weak, and that within a short time the Ottoman Empire would collapse. He therefore supported the nationalists. Being a Slav, and head of the orthodox Greek Church he demanded the redress of the grievances of the Slav subjects of the Sultan. Austria was interested in the dissolution of the Ottoman Empire, as she could expand only that way. To keep Austria satisfied Germany supported her. The Andrassy Note and the Berlin Memorandum were drafted in that spirit. Although Russia was in favour of putting pressure upon the Porte for necessary reforms she was not willing to force a war. Attempts were made to solve the problem by diplomatic talks. But Turkey was not yielding. When Russia was forced to declare war, she agreed to respect the English interests, and asked England to define her spheres of influence. It was under pressure from England again that the Treaty of San Stefano had to be submitted to the Congress of Powers. The policy of Russia was therefore clear, but the English policy was not so definite. England was not prepared to put pressure upon the Porte. Russia was her

rival in the East, and it is on account of this rivalry that she was not prepared to join hands with the Eastern Empire. When the atrocities of the Turks in Bulgaria created a strong wave of indignation, and in which Gladstone took a leading part Disraeli still remained obstinate. After the settlement of the San Stefano treaty he declared that no solution of the Eastern problem was satisfactory till that was referred to the Congress of the Powers. But at the same time private negotiations were carried on with both Turkey and Russia. By the secret Convention of Cyprus the Sultan was promised British help if Russia claimed any place in Asia Minor, and by agreement with Russia the future of Bulgaria was settled, and Russia was promised Batoum, Kars and Ardahan in Asia Minor. These secret arrangements were finally accepted by the Congress. After the Congress Disraeli returned to England with peace in honour. England had no interests in the Balkan area and she did not like to antagonise Turkey as her route to India lay through the Turkish territories. It was on account of the support that England gave to Turkey that the latter defied the other Powers, and did not carry out the promised reforms. If England had joined the other Powers in putting pressure upon the Porte the war could have been avoided.

Turkey was responsible for the war, and she was encouraged to remain stiff by the English Government. It is also doubtful whether the free Balkan States would have come into existence but for the war. The national movement of the Slavs was the root cause of the trouble, and it is believed that the smaller nationalists were encouraged by Russia. In the beginning however the movement started with demands by the Christian subjects for an improvement in the method of Government. If Turkey had acceded to these demands the war could have been averted at that time.

THE TREATY OF BERLIN

Q. 49. The Treaty of Berlin of 1878 was a compromise and like all compromises, pregnant with future troubles. Discuss this statement, and give the main provisions of the Treaty of Berlin.

(P. U. 1928).

The treaty of Berlin was a modification of the Treaty of San Stefano. The Powers were not willing to give Russia the predominance that she acquired by dictating the terms to Turkey and by creating a greater Bulgaria. The Balkan people were not satisfied, nor were the other Powers. But Russia could not be deprived of her claims to indemnity and territorial compensation for taking up the cause of the Slav peoples. Austria also demanded some influence in the Ottoman Empire and so she was allowed to occupy Bosnia and Herzegovina. To maintain the dignity of Turkey her suzerainty was conceded in the autonomous States of Bulgaria and Eastern Rumelia, and her direct rule over Macedonia was maintained. Serbia was allowed to expand at the expense of Bulgaria, Montenegro secured access to the sea at Antivari. All the States except Roumania and Greece were given something. These arrangements were a compromise. The national sentiments were not fully satisfied as the boundaries of the newly created States were not properly adjusted. Macedonia, and border lands between Bulgaria and Greece remained a veritable ground for dispute. The partition of Bulgaria was undertaken with a view to deprive Russia of her predominance, but it ignored the sentiments of the Bulgars. All these problems gave rise to troubles in the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth centuries. The boundaries had to be readjusted, and Turkey had to be driven out of Europe.

The main provisions of the Treaty of Berlin were :—

(1) The clause regarding Bulgaria in the Treaty of San Stefano was rescinded, Bulgaria was divided into three parts, Bulgaria proper from the Danube to the Balkans was made an autonomous State under the suzerainty of Turkey, Eastern Rumelia south of the Balkans was created a self-governing province under a Christian Governor, and Macedonia remained under direct rule of Turkey

(2) Montenegro gained access to the sea at Antivari and Serbia obtained Uskub and Monastir.

- 1878 Russo-Turkish war :
 Treaty of Berlin — Roumania, Serbia and Montenegro became independent.
 Bosnia and Herzegovina placed under Austria.
 Bulgaria—autonomous
 Eastern Rumelia—self-governing.
1881. Greece obtains Thessaly and part of Epirus
 Roumania becomes a kingdom
- 1885 Revolt of Eastern Rumelia—united with Bulgaria
1897. Greco-Turkish war
- 1908 Austria annexed Bosnia and Herzegovina
- 1912 Balkan war—Crete united with Greece.

FOREIGN POLICY OF BISMARCK

- Q 50. Describe the foreign policy of Bismarck after 1871.
 (P. U- 1925).

In the German Empire Bismarck became the Chancellor, and controlled the foreign policy till 1890. After the Franco-Prussian war he felt that the annexation of Alsace and Lorraine from France would not be easily forgiven, and that the French people could not cherish any good feelings towards the Germans. His foreign policy was guided by the fear of the French. He therefore sought the friendship of other powers. There was no chance of friendship with England so long as Gladstone was in power. Bismarck therefore tried to win the good-will of Russia and Austria. The relations between Russia and Prussia were friendly, and Bismarck tried to remove the bitterness between Germany and Austria. He arranged a meeting of the three Emperors at Berlin, and formed an informal League of the Three Emperors as a triangular rampart against revolutionary France. Austria accepted German friendship with a view to gratify her ambitions in the East. But her interests in the East clashed with those of Russia who wanted to occupy Constantinople. Germany also had no sympathy with the Russian ambitions. A secret

understanding with Austria was entered into, by which Germany would agree to the occupation of Bosnia and Herzegovina by Austria, provided Austria remained neutral in a war between Austria and Russia. After the Russo-Turkish war a formal defensive alliance was formed between Austria and Germany (Oct. 7, 1879). This was the first of a series of this nature in the schemes of Bismarck. Bismarck would have liked an offensive and defensive alliance, but Austria did not agree. This alliance was first concluded for five years, and then renewed for every three years till 1914. Russia was alienated, and the Three Emperors' League became weak.

Bismarck considered these alliances as insurance policy. In 1881 was formed a Triple Alliance between Austria, Russia and Germany. This alliance was renewed in 1884 and remained in force till 1888. By this alliance Austria-Hungary felt secure in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Russia had no fear from Germany or Austria-Hungary in case of a war with a third power, and Germany felt that the contracting parties would not combine with France.

In 1882 Bismarck drew Italy into an alliance with Austria and Germany. The Triple Alliance thus formed was also a defensive alliance. It provided that if Italy were attacked by France, then Germany and Austria-Hungary would come to her help, and if Germany were attacked by France Italy would come to her help. But if any one of them were attacked by more than one power then all the three contracting parties would fight together. In case of war with a fourth power other than France the two other would remain neutral. This Triple Alliance did not cancel the old Dual Alliance between Germany and Austria-Hungary. By these alliances Bismarck tried to maintain the peace of Europe. Although France and England did not contract any alliance with Germany they were on friendly terms, as Germany supported their colonial ambitions in Africa. Germany thus enjoyed a unique position of hegemony. During the Boulangist movement in France Bismarck tried to maintain the friendship with

Russia by the "Reinsurance Treaty" of 1887. He was also anxious for some kind of understanding with England, but could not break her indifference towards European politics. He, however, managed to bring about an agreement between England and Italy, which was joined later on by Austria for maintaining the existing situation in the the Mediterranean and Black Sea (1887). England also promised support to Italy in pursuing her ambitions in North Africa. Grant and Temperly have thus estimated his policy "A general survey of the Bismarckian policy between 1870 and 1890 shows that it was primarily inspired by the idea of keeping France in order, and enabling Germany to develop her new provinces and her enormous resources undisturbed. He encouraged Italy and England to rival France in colonial development, so as to divert her attention from Alsace-Lorraine. He secured Germany against France by alliance with Italy and against Russia by alliance with Austria."

BISMARCK & DISRAELI.

Q 51. Compare and contrast the work of Bismarck and Disraeli, with particular reference to the lasting results of their policy. *(P. U. 1931).*

Bismarck's first achievement was the exclusion of Austria from Germany, and the unification of Germany under Prussia. After the Franco-Prussian war he directed his attention to the maintenance of peace in Europe, by forming alliances with different powers. In the Berlin Congress he acted as the honest broker and did not utilise his position to further the ends of his country. In domestic affairs he organised an effective army in Prussia, and after the unification of Germany he tried to improve the condition of the people by a number of social and economic measures. He improved the industries of Germany by the policy of protection, and promoted the welfare of the working men by introducing the system of insurance against sickness, accident and old age. Bismarck was reluctant to waste energies in the schemes of colonial expansion.

the oppressed nations, and although he supported Austria and was not prepared to let Russia have her own way his attitude in the deliberations of Berlin was more dignified than that of Disraeli who by secret negotiations had already won some advantage for England. Bismarck had no such faith in the Turk as Disraeli had. His foreign policy was based upon intimate knowledge of the affairs of Europe, whereas the English statesman had his own prejudices and predilections. Both of them had done good work in social reforms, in promoting the interests of workingmen. As the unification of Germany goes to the credit of Bismarck, Disraeli may claim some credit for the Reforms Act, and the Imperial Policy. As the policy of protection has advanced German industries, the purchase of the Suez Canal has been a great commercial success to England.

COLONIAL DEVELOPMENT OF GERMANY.

Q. 52. Explain the colonial and maritime development of Germany since 1870 (P. U. 1916)

After the Franco-Prussian War Germany quickly developed her agriculture and industries. The protective system so increased the industrial output that there was a search of new markets for German goods. The population also began to increase, and there was a keen desire to find an outlet for the surplus population as for the surplus commodities. The idea of founding colonies did not appeal to Bismarck. But there were private ventures for advancing German commerce. There was a society called the Central Union for Commercial Geography and the Advancement of German Foreign interests, and another Society with the name of African Society. The cities of Hamburg, Bremen and Frankfort were interested in the schemes of expansion. A German colonial association was formed at Frankfort in 1882, but most profitable parts of the world had already been occupied by other Powers, so the attention was drawn towards Africa. Several trade centres were established on the West Coast. In 1884 German protectorate was established over Togoland in Upper

Guinea, and the Cameroons near French Congo. The same year the German South-West Africa was acquired by an agreement with Portugal and England. In the East Coast the German East Africa was taken on lease from the Sultan of Zanzibar (1888) and later on his rights were purchased with one million dollars. Within two years Germany became the third European Power in Africa. The partition of Africa was arranged in a Conference of the Powers at Berlin in 1884-85 under the presidency of Bismarck. The new territories were developed for the supply of raw materials for the factories in Germany, and for the employment of German emigrants. But the emigrants did not like the climate of Africa and went largely to the New World. Simultaneous with the establishment of colonies in Africa the Germans acquired some possessions on the Pacific. They obtained in New Guinea the country which is known as Kaiser Wilhelm's Land, and Samoa. After the Sino-Japanese War she took the port of Kiauchau opposite Korea (1897).

Germany built up her colonies without a strong navy. But these colonies required a navy for their defence. Bismarck tried to develop Kiel as a naval base, but the development of the German Navy started with William II. In the meantime German trade has expanded and along with it German maritime activities. In 1871 German shipping was only 892,000 tons, and her share of the mercantile marine of the world was 5.2 per cent. In 1905 her tonnage had increased to 2,200,000, and she had 9.9 per cent of the world's mercantile marine, and by 1913 Germany occupied the second place in the shipping of the world with 5,000,000 tons. The trade has increased. In 1880 her imports were worth £14,10,00,000 and exports £14,48,00,000, and in 1907 they were £44,30,00,000 and £35,00,00,000 respectively. The progress of trade and commerce was due to the policy of Bismarck, and of mercantile marine to that of William II. Germany competed with other Powers in International trade and colonial expansion. The peace established in Germany led to her prosperity and prosperity produced

ambition for expansion. The increasing population and the increased output required fresh fields and new markets.

EXPANSION OF EUROPE

Q. 53. "After 1870 European diplomacy was mainly concerned with Africa and Asia" Discuss and explain this. (P U 1931).

The Franco-Prussian War marks a stage in the history of Europe. Italy obtained her unity, and the German States were united in an Empire. The rise of these national Governments brought about a re-adjustment in international relations. Germany now tried to develop her own resources and to form alliances with other Powers with a view to develop the peace of Europe. The Balance of Power so long confined to the continent of Europe now worked in the undeveloped and decadent countries of Africa and Asia. The Powers no longer satisfied with city or nation states thought of building up world-states. They gave up the idea of liberalism and started the process of carrying their industrial output, surplus population, religion, culture and civilization abroad, and carving out for themselves colonies, spheres of influence, protectorates and mandates in places where the people were not sufficiently strong to resist. The newly organised national states of Europe indulged in a spirit of domination over other peoples. The countries which were zealous of national freedom at home ruthlessly destroyed the freedom of nations in Africa and Asia. After settling their disputes in Europe they began to find fields of exploitation far and near. The scramble began in Africa where France and Great Britain had already acquired some territories.

The British Prime Minister Disraeli carried out a clever piece of transaction by purchasing the shares of the Khedive in the Suez Canal. The next move was to extend financial control over Egypt. The Khedive Ismail was forced to abdicate in 1879 and he was succeeded by his son Tewfik who meekly surrendered himself into the hands of the foreigners. This gave rise to a national rising in

Egypt, the British Government decided upon military intervention, but France declined to join. The result was the establishment of the British Protectorate. They became the "adviser" to the Khedive and promised to withdraw their troops as soon as the state of the country and the organisation of the proper means for the maintenance of the Khedive's authority would permit it.

Connected with Egypt is the province of Sudan in the Upper Nile Valley. The Mahdists rose in revolt against the Egyptians, and the British Officers were placed in a difficult situation. The expedition of General Gordon ended in a tragic disaster in 1885, which was avenged by Kitchener in 1896—98, who conquered Sudan for Egypt and England. A conflict between the French and the British at Fashoda was averted by the resolute attitude of the latter, and the French plan of connecting the East with the West Africa failed.

Russia made great advance in Asia. She had extended her dominions into Siberia, and then marched southwards. The approach of Russia towards Afghanistan upset the British on account of their interests in India. This fear of the Russians occasioned the Afghan War. Russian advance towards the East brought her into conflict with Japan. The occupation of Port Arthur was the cause of the Russo-Japanese War in 1905, and to keep Russia under check England entered into an alliance with Japan.

The competition in Africa was very acute. France and England had already acquired extensive territories in the North and the South. Germany came into the field very late. Within a short time she acquired extensive territories in West and East Africa. She also obtained Kiau-chau in China. The policy of colonial expansion was discussed in the Berlin Congress in 1885. As a result of that Conference the continent of Africa was partitioned between Great Britain, France, Germany and Belgium. The new territories thus acquired were developed in the economic interest of the European countries. The conflict

between the Boers and the British in South Africa was complicated by the sympathies of the German Kaiser with the former. Germany also developed a scheme of constructing a Railroad from Berlin to Baghdad through Constantinople. In this project she came into conflict with Russia and England. The growth of the influence of Germany was one of the causes of the Anglo-Russian Convention regarding Persia. Another part of Africa where the Powers came into conflict was Morocco. Germany opposed the growth of the influence of France there. A crisis was imminent in 1911 when the French troops proceeded to Morocco, and to counter-act their influence the German gunboat *Panther* was despatched to Agadir. Through the intervention of England the Kaiser came to an agreement, Germany abandoned all claims in Morocco except the "Open door" for trade. She received compensation in Congo. The Agadir incident was a humiliation for Germany. The next trouble arose over Tripoli, which belonged to Turkey, but on account of the Balkan War she could not resist the advance of Italy.

Since 1870 therefore the European Powers were greatly concerned with affairs in Africa and Asia. They were anxious to keep their own possessions intact and not to allow others to threaten their vested interests.

FRENCH COLONIAL EMPIRE.

Q. 54 Give an account of the development of the French Colonial Empire since 1880. Describe its effect on France's relations with other Powers of Europe. (*P. U. 1926*).

By 1880 France had extensive colonies in North and West Africa, in Indo-China in Asia, and also in America. She started the game of acquiring territorial spoils in Africa. The first acquisition in point of time was Tunis. This was one of the Barbary States owing allegiance to the Sultan of Turkey. The ambitions of France were not opposed by the English Government as France did not object to the British occupation of Cyprus. In 1881 the French troops were sent to Tunis from Algeria and forced the Bey to accept

the French Protectorate. Italy had her eyes on Tunis, but the French action took her by surprise. Bismarck supported the French in order that they might forget the loss of Alsace-Lorraine. This annexation alienated Italy who entered into the Triple Alliance with Austria-Hungary and Germany. In Western Africa she made extensive annexation in the Senegal, Guinea, Dahomey, the Ivory Coast, and the region of the Niger and the North of the Congo. She occupied Sahara and tried to connect the West with the East, and this brought her into conflict with England at Fashoda. But she had to withdraw on account of the firm attitude of England (1898).

In Asia France imposed her protectorate over Annam in 1883, and forced China to cede Tonkin in 1885. She conquered Madagascar in Indian Ocean in 1895, which was later on made a French colony. In 1912 France established a Protectorate over Morocco. This involved her in a conflict with Germany. The war was averted by the intervention of England. France acquired the Protectorate, but had to give compensation in Congo. The relations with Germany were already bitter, and they became still worse in the Moroccan affairs. This led her to seek the Alliance of England and Italy. Mr. Delcasse, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, wanted to follow a more independent and self-respecting Foreign policy so that France might not be in fear of Germany. Her relations with England and Italy had been strained by colonial rivalries, and jealousies. England and France quarrelled over Egypt, and Italy and France over Tunis. A commercial treaty with Italy was arranged and she was given a free hand in Tripoli on the assurance that Italy would not stand in the way of France in Morocco which she wanted to possess in order that the interests of Algeria might not suffer. The relations with England were not friendly since the Fashoda incident. But in 1904 they came to an agreement known as the *Entente cordiale*, by which France recognised England's special interests in Egypt, and England recognised the special interests of France in Morocco. Germany wanted to have a say in

these matters. The Algerias Conference met in 1906 to discuss this question, and there on account of the attitude of England the primacy of the French interests was recognised. The Agadir incident in 1912 was a challenge to France by Germany in interpreting the terms of the Algeciras Settlement. Again France triumphed. But the affairs left its marks upon international relations.

As a Colonial Empire France occupies a very important place. The French colonies are happy to be associated with the Republic, as the French institutions help to develop the spirit of self-government. Algeria is treated as an integral part of France, and is divided into three Departments.

RUSSIAN REFORMS.

Q. 55 Describe the character of Alexander II. What measures did he adopt to improve the condition of Russia?

(P. U. 1926).

Alexander II succeeded his father Nicholas in 1855 before the Crimean War had come to an end. He was in his thirty-ninth year when he came to the throne. He had received a good training so that he could discharge his responsibilities with ability. He always tried to understand the real problems of his country and was anxious to improve the conditions of the people. But he was not an outstanding personality, his character was rather representative than commanding as has been remarked by a critic.

In the early part of his reign Russia was suffering from the effects of the Crimean War and under the sting of the great national humiliation there was a wide-spread desire for reforms. The Russian life was in a state of stagnation, and there was no desire on the part of the people to save the administrative machinery which was responsible for cramping all their activities. Alexander II in a fit of generosity promised to place Russia on the road to progress and to remove all the fetters which strangled the national life. He was not a liberal by nature, but he found that without some

reforms it would be difficult to shake off the depressing effects of the Crimean war. He was timid in his policy and when people expressed disappointment at the rate of progress and an attempt was made on his life by the discontented he retraced his steps. In the second period of his reign from 1865 to his assassination in 1881 he was guided by his reactionary advisers, and his administration was marked by retrograde measures.

Immediately on the conclusion of the peace at Paris Alexander II issued a manifesto expressing his hope that "the internal order of the State may be settled and brought to perfection, that justice and mercy may reign in our Law Courts, that the desire for education and all manner of useful activity may spread and grow stronger". The first measures of his liberal administration were the relaxation of the restrictions imposed by his father upon the freedom of the Press, on the independence of the Universities and on foreign travel. But the most important measure associated with his name is the abolition of the Serf system.

The peasants in Russia lived a very miserable life. They were treated by the landlords no better than slaves. They had to work for their masters and to submit to them in every respect. The whole country was divided into estates except in the extreme North and extreme South. The landlord kept a part to be cultivated directly with serf-labour, and the other part he made over to the peasants, on rental. In Great Russia ownership of land was vested in the Village Community, the woods, pastures and stream were used in common, lands were distributed among the peasants for a term, and the houses only were in individual possession. The Tsar appointed a Committee to enquire into the state of the peasantry, and in 1858 a declaration was made that the peasants should be given facilities to purchase the land from their masters. In 1861 a Ukase was issued abolishing the serf system. These measures marked him out as a "liberator." The reforms were however carried out very slowly by the landlords, and very heavy amounts were demanded as compensation. The

Ukase although it failed to achieve its object marks the beginning of a social and economic revolution. The old social order could not hold its own against the impact of the new movement. About twenty million serfs were emancipated and provided with lands.

The next measure he introduced was the reformation of the system of Local Government, by the Zemstvo Law of 1864. The village communities or *Mirs* were managed by assemblies consisting of the heads of families. Above the *Mirs* were the District Zemstvos, 360 in number. These District councils were composed of deputies elected by the nobility, the cities and the peasants. The District Zemstvos, sent their deputies to Provincial Zemstvos, of which there were thirty-four in Russia. These local assemblies were entrusted with the management of local affairs such as roads, bridges, public buildings, churches and schools, relief of the poor, prison and public health. They were given the right to levy local taxes, which however were collected by the police. Municipal Government in towns was set up in 1870.

The administration of justice was remodelled by the law of 1864. The old inquisitorial system was abolished, and the courts were now to be held in public. In criminal cases trial by jury was introduced. Public prosecutors were appointed, and a new order of barristers came into existence to help the defendants and suitors. Locally, justice was to be administered by Justices of the Peace appointed by the District and Town Councils. Judges of the higher Courts were made independent of the Government and could not be removed except by a decision of a court of law. All classes were declared equal before the law. In the matter of law and justice Russia thus placed herself in line with the progressive nations of Western Europe.

In the matter of freedom of the Press the Tsar revised his opinion by 1860 and by 1862 he restored a thoroughly rigid censorship. This was again slightly relaxed in 1865.

His vacillations made the revolutionaries feel that he had abandoned the liberal cause, and there was a strong under-current of discontent.

His educational reforms consisted of a new University Code which restored autonomy to the Universities in 1863. A new Secondary Education Code was introduced next year, classical and technical gymnasia were established and by another measure the control of elementary education was entrusted to the Zemstvos and town councils.

In 1863 the Poles rose in revolt, but were crushed with a heavy hand with the support of the Prussians. An attempt was made on the life of Alexander II in 1866, and then he retreated from his policy of liberalism. The direct result of this reaction was the growth of Anarchist and Nihilist movements. Later on the Tsar was engrossed in European politics and could not pay attention to local affairs. He was killed by a bomb in 1881.

NIHILISM.

Q 56. What is Nihilism? Trace the rise and course of development of Nihilist propaganda in Russia. (P. U. 1920).

Nihilism is an intellectual movement in Russia in revolt against despotism and superstitions. When there was a strong wave of despotism under Alexander II the Russians began to reflect their own conditions. They began to study the works of the radical philosophers and scientists of the Western Europe, and under the influence of the rationalists they began to approach every question from a rational standpoint. They scoffed at religion, family ties and Government. They were practically on a line with the Encyclopædists of France, and a large number of sincere young men and women devoted themselves to spread their high ideals and to work for the uplift of the people. Their attitude of intellectual challenge, and revolt against the whole established order and their reckless criticism of Government brought down upon them the wrath of the authorities. The measures taken

against them led a large number to leave Russia and to take refuge either in Switzerland or Britain. One of these refugees was Michael Bakunin who preached the Gospel of "Anarchy", the destruction of every existing institution, Emperors and Kings, Chambers and Parliament, Capitalists and landowners. This doctrine of destruction was later on superseded by a new ideal of society which was to be thoroughly remodelled.

The young reformers took upon themselves the task of educating their countrymen in the new ideals of social life. They went in among the people, joined with them in their daily labour and tried to put new life in the working men by exhorting them to shake off their acquiescence in the prevalent order. Between two to three thousand such missionaries were engaged in carrying on the Nihilist Propaganda between 1872 and 1878. But their efforts did not receive sufficient response. The stolid peasant could not be easily moved. On the other hand Government took vigorous measures to suppress this movement as dangerous to society and Government, and the active workers were arrested and banished to Siberia. A large number of them fled to foreign lands, and carried on propaganda from abroad. The repression resorted to by the Government produced a wave of terrorism in Russia. The ardent patriots felt bitterly the miseries under a despotic Government and organised revolutionary terrorism in reply to the terrorism of the Government. They thought that there was no salvation for Russia till the unscrupulous officials were got rid of. The terrorist movement redoubled the activity of the authorities specially of the police, and a large number of revolutionaries were executed, thousands were sent to Siberia. The terrorists on their part increased their activities, and made several attempts on the life of the Tsar Alexander II, who ultimately fell a victim to their plots in 1881. His successor Alexander III intensified the repressive policy. Before this Alexander II had appointed Loris Melikoff as the virtual dictator. Melikoff advised a more conciliatory policy, as he believed some reforms

would kill Nihilism. Alexander was willing to concede, but before any effective steps could be taken the Tsar was assassinated. The reign of his successor Alexander III was one of stern repression. He tried to keep down the growth of democratic and liberal ideas, and in fact Russia was kept "frozen"

SPAIN.

Q. 57. Summarise the history of Spain during the century following the national up-rising against Napoleon and indicating clearly when and why the country became prominent in international politics. (*P. U. 1917*).

Q. 58. Trace briefly the history of Spain or of Switzerland from 1815 to the end of the century. (*P. U. 1815—1914*)

History of Spain. After the downfall of Napoleon his brother was removed from the throne of Spain and the Bourbon King Ferdinand VII was restored. Although his return to power was received with enthusiasm he soon lost his popularity by his reactionary measures. His character was odious and his intellect weak. He was a miserable compound of bigotry, sensualism, superstition and cruelty. On accession he revoked the constitution of 1812, dissolved the Cortes, restored the Inquisition, recalled the Jesuits, reinstated the nobles with all their oppressive privileges, gagged the Press and persecuted all the supporters of the Bonapartist regime. Soon the people felt disgusted, and secret societies were formed to overthrow the Government. The salaries of the soldiers were not regularly paid, and they were the first to rise in insurrection. The risings became so wide-spread in 1820 that the King promised to restore the constitution. He took the oath of allegiance according to the new constitution on March 9, 1820 and adopted a liberal policy. But the Powers assembled at Verona in 1822 decided to intervene. The French troops entered Spain in April 1823, and restored the absolute authority of Ferdinand. An attempt was made to bring the revolted

colonies in America back to the Spanish control, but it failed on account of the attitude of the United States of America and England.

Ferdinand VII died in 1833. There was dispute between his daughter Isabela, and brother Don Carlos regarding the succession. A civil war lasted for seven years. Isabela's mother Christina acted as her Regent, and by force of circumstances granted a liberal constitution. England supported the cause of Isabela, as that would be conducive to constitutionalism. The war came to an end in 1840. But Christina had to leave the country on October 12, 1840, and Isabela when she came of age in 1843 assumed direct rule. She remained on the throne till 1868. But her reign was marked by absolutism nearly as unqualified as that of her predecessors. In 1860 another attempt was made to remove Isabela from the throne by the eldest son of Don Carlos, but it failed. That year Spain sent an expedition to Mexico along with France and England, and next year she regained possession of San Domingo.

Dissatisfaction was expressed towards the arbitrary Government of the Queen. She had abused the constitution, suppressed the liberty of the Press and placed the education of the young in the hands of the Jesuits. During her long reign Spain experienced a set-back in every sphere of life. She proved an incompetent ruler and people talked openly of her scandalous character. A revolution took place in 1868 under the leadership of Marshal Serrano and General Prim. In a helpless situation Isabela left Spain, and the throne was declared vacant on September 30, 1869. The Provisional Government issued a manifesto stating that the principles of the new Government would be sovereignty of the people, religious and educational liberty and liberty of the Press. After some controversy regarding the form of Government it was decided by the Cortes elected by universal suffrage that there would be a monarchy with a liberal democratic constitution having the Cortes of two houses, a Congress elected by universal suffrage for three

years, and a Senate elected by special electors for 12 years. In the quest of a King offers were made to several persons. The offer made to Prince Leopold of Hohen-Zollern-Sigmaringen led to the Franco-Prussian War. Finally the offer was accepted by Amadeo, the son of King Victor Emmanuel of Italy. The new King however did not receive proper support. He was opposed by the Carlists, by the supporters of Alfonso, son of Isabela, and by the clergy. Finding his position untenable he abdicated in February 1873. On his withdrawal there was a great confusion. For a time a Republic was established, but it could not endure long. Then Serrano became the Dictator, in December 1874. Alfonso returned to power with the support of the Generals. Alfonso XII reigned from 1874 to 1885. He agreed to a new constitution in 1876, with a Parliament of two Chambers and a responsible ministry, the executive power was vested in the King, and legislative in the King and Parliament. Alfonso XII died in November 1885 and his widow Maria Christina acted as Regent for a child born a few months later, who ascended the throne in 1902 as Alfonso XIII. The most important event of this period is the revolt of Cuba. In 1878 self-government was promised to that colony, but it was not carried out. So another revolution took place in 1895. The War continued for a long time, and the United States was forced to intervene in 1898. Spain was disastrously defeated and by the Treaty of Paris she renounced Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Philippine islands. The vast colonies of Spain disappeared, and she has now a few small places in Africa.

Spain became prominent in international politics first when the powers intervened in the interest of Ferdinand VII, and then when President Monroe of the United States announced the policy of his Government regarding the American colonies. The second time that Spain loomed large was when the dispute between Don Carlos and Isabela was going. England and France supported Isabela, and the Eastern Powers Carlos. The third occasion was

when Isabela left and Spain was looking for a new monarch. The offer to Prince Leopold of Hohen-Zollern-Sigmaringen led to the Franco-Prussian War.

SWITZERLAND.

HISTORY OF SWITZERLAND DURING THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.

Unlike Spain the history of Switzerland has been of domestic interest, except in the wars of the Sonderbund in 1847. The constitutional progress she made during the century is really interesting, and it has made great progress in population, industry and in education. She is playing an important part now as the seat of the League of Nations because of her neutral position in international politics. The Vienna Congress in 1815 guaranteed its perpetual neutrality. A new constitution was adopted that year, the chief features of which were.—

(1) Each Canton would have an equal vote in the Federal Diet.

(2) There was no fixed federal capital, the Diet could meet alternately at Berne, Zurich and Lucerne.

(3) Cantons could not conclude peace separately with foreign countries.

(4) There would be a Federal Army.

(5) Rights of the monasteries would be recognised.

This was the constitution of a loose confederation of 22 Cantons. The form of Government in the Cantons was not similar, in some it was democratic but in most places power was in the hands of the privileged classes. The Diet consisted not of the representatives, but of the ambassadors of the constituent states. Switzerland was thus a federation of states, and not a federal state. The Cantons enjoyed all powers that were not definitely granted to the Diet. These Cantons followed a reactionary policy till 1830, and on account of risings after the July Revolution the Federal Diet decided to revise the constitution. The

movement started in the Cantons. In 1840 in the Canton of Aargau an attempt was made to suppress eight monasteries. This was considered as a violation of the pact of 1815, and seven Roman Catholic Cantons formed a Union, called the Sonderbund, for the protection of Catholic interests. This brought about a civil war, in which the Sonderbund was defeated in the course of three weeks. A new constitution was adopted in 1848.

The Government was vested in two houses: (1) a Council of States composed of two representatives from each Canton, and (2) a National Council elected direct by the people. The two bodies in a joint session elected the Federal Tribunal and the Bundesrath or Federal Council consisting of seven members of each. Berne was selected as the Capital. The Confederation thus formed enjoyed larger powers: the control of foreign affairs, the army, tariffs, the postal system and the coinage. The Cantons could legislate concerning civil and criminal matters, religion and education. The new constitution was a great step in advance, and emphasised for the first time the idea of nationality. Since the adoption of this constitution Switzerland has pursued a course of peaceful development and has evolved the practice of referendum and initiative.

A movement for revision of the constitution started again in 1868. The changes proposed were in the direction of democratic advance. Greater powers were to be placed in the hands of the Federal Assembly. The French and Ultramontane Cantons were opposed to this movement, as it would mean gradual Germanisation. The opposition was overcome and the new constitution was adopted in 1874, by which the Federal authorities obtained greater powers in all matters relating to the law, the Army, the church, education, peace, war and foreign relations. The laws of the Cantons were made more uniform. The management of the contingent belonging to the Cantons was taken away from the Cantons, the ecclesiastical authorities were placed under the control of the State, and primary

education was made compulsory and secular. Many other changes have been introduced since then

THE PAPACY.

Q 59. Give some account of the part played by the Papacy in European History from 1815—70. (*P. U. 1931*).

Napoleon had driven the Pope from his states and had abolished his temporal power which were restored to him by the Vienna Congress. The Government of the papal states was in the hands of the priests, the provincial rulers, and higher officials were all of the clergy. On the restoration all the old evils were restored. Brigands were so strong in the Papal States that the Pope had to enter into a treaty with them. French laws were repealed, and vaccination and gas illumination abolished. Inquisition was restored and education was thoroughly controlled by the clergy. Reactionary forces were fully at work. When the national movement became very strong there was a rising in the Papal States in 1831. Almost every town joined in the movement, and the insurgents declared the temporal power of the Pope abolished. With the intervention of Austria the Pope recovered his authority, but a promise was extracted from him that he would carry out extensive reforms, and appoint laymen to responsible positions in the Government. But the promise was not kept, so another rising took place in 1832. Austria again sent troops, and this time France intervened in the interest of the European equilibrium. The French troops occupied the fortress of Ancona and did not want to withdraw so long as Austrian troops would remain within the Papal States. On the withdrawal of the Austrians in 1838 the French gave up Ancona, and absolutism was completely restored. The Pope supported the maintenance of the Austrian influence in Italy as Austria stood by him in the revolution. As he was hostile to liberalism the people were anxious to deprive him of his temporal power. Although the Pope was a reactionary and a party to the maintenance of the Austrian influence as a leader of the

Catholic Church he received the allegiance of many monarchs. There were some thinkers in Italy, who believed that the unity of Italy could be attained under the leadership of the Pope. Gioberti in his "the Moral and Civil primacy of the Italians" stated that Italy could be united in a federation under the leadership of the Pope, as only by this process the foreign aggression could be averted. But to many this idea was preposterous. The ideas of Gioberti however had some effect in the Papal States. A liberal Pope was elected in 1846. Pope Pius IX gave an impetus to the national movement by granting amnesty to the political offenders and suspects. He appointed an advisory body consisting of laymen. He relaxed the censorship of the press, and instituted a national guard. He expressed his sympathy with the national movement, and people thought that he would be able to bring unity to Italy. His example was followed by other princes. The Italian nationalists although congratulated Pius IX on his liberal measures held the view that the Pope should be stripped of temporal power. Pius IX would not go so far, and in the revolution of 1848 he could not join the war against Austria. His minister Rossi was assassinated in November, 1848 and the Pope in fear fled to Gaeta in the kingdom of Naples. Henceforth he ceased to have any part in the national movement. Not only did he abandon the liberal cause but he became a thorough reactionary. On his flight from Rome the revolutionaries occupied the Eternal City and established a Republic with Mazzini at the head. But the French troops drove out the revolutionaries, and restored the authority of the Pope (June 30, 1849). The Pope did not join the "Italian war of Independence" but at the conclusion of the war nationalists desired that the Pope should be urged to introduce reforms into his state. Pius IX remained unmoved. He had no vestige in him of his old liberalism. But his subjects were greatly stirred by the movement in the North. Signs of unrest appeared in the Marches and in Umbria. The Pope kept his States under control with the help of an Army consisting of soldiers from France, Ireland and Belgium. Victor Emmanuel in protest against this

oppression sent the Italian Army and defeated the Papal troops at Castelfidardo, plebiscites were taken in the provinces, and the conquered provinces were annexed to the Kingdom of Victor Emmanuel, in 1861 and he now assumed the title of the King of Italy. The Pope still had his supporters in France, and Rome was protected by French troops. Another attempt was made by Garibaldi in 1867 to capture the city, but he was defeated at Mentana. On the withdrawal of the French troops in 1870 the Italian army occupied Rome. Since then the Pope has retired into the palace of the Vatican. The Ecumenical Council called that year declared the authority of the Pope as infallible. This decree had some effect in the Catholic countries, and led to repercussion in Germany and France. France till then had followed Napoleon's concordat. The Pope's authority was recognised in full in Spain and Austria. The German Kultur Kampf movement ended in a compromise.

RISE OF JAPAN.

Q. 60. Trace clearly the growth of Japan in international importance during the past sixty years. How far has that growth affected the truth of the statement that "the Pacific is a European lake." (P. U. 1917).

The rise of Japan as a great Power is recent history. Down to 1868 she was a mediaeval state, in every aspect, social, economic and political. The real ruler Mikado was a nominal figure, and the actual work of Government was carried on by the *Shogun* who was at the head of a hierarchy of the Daimios and Samurai. In 1868 the Mikado forced the Shogun to resign, and abolished the old feudal system of land-tenure and local government. Since then he had developed Japan as a Modern State, with a new constitution set up on the Western lines. A Japanese Parliament, with two Chambers met for the first time in 1890. Education was developed with great rapidity, Universities established at Tokio and Kioto, compulsory military service introduced. Students were sent abroad to study Science and Industrial methods. The military system was reorganised on German

models, a fleet was constructed under the supervision of English officers. Railways were constructed, and side by side with political and social changes her economic system was reorganised. Within a short time Japan became a powerful state in the East. Japan was no longer in a state of isolation. She came in contact with progressive Western nations and placed herself in line with them.

Japan's position as an important state was ensured by her success against China in the War of 1894-95, both on land and sea. China was forced to accept the terms dictated by Japan in the Treaty of Shimonoseki. The independence of Korea was recognised and the Peninsula of Liao-Tung with Port Arthur and the island of Formosa were ceded to Japan. China had to pay an indemnity of £ 50,000,000 to Japan, and till this money was paid Wei-Hai-Wei would remain under the occupation of Japan. Further the Japanese were allowed to navigate in Chinese waters. At one bound Japan advanced to the first place in the Far East. The European Powers got nervous at the rise of this new Empire, and could not bear her presence in the mainland of Asia. Russia had been eagerly trying to get a warm water port and would have liked to occupy the places ceded to Japan. She was helped by France and Germany and the three powers put pressure upon Japan to give up Port Arthur and the Liao-Tung Peninsula. Japan could not forget the insolence of these European Powers and waited for an opportunity to teach them a lesson.

The Sino-Japanese War making a turning point in the history of European politics, as it transferred the attention of the Powers from Europe to the broad world. Russia took advantage of her new position as the protectress of the integrity of China. She obtained permission to build railroad in Manchuria, and gradually brought a large number of soldiers there. Germany got the Russian support in obtaining a port in China. As a compensation for the murder of two German missionaries in the province of Shantung Germany obtained Kiachow on ninety-nine years' lease.

Shortly afterwards Russia took Port Arthur on lease for 25 years (March 15, 1895) and fortified it, but England obtained Wei-Hai-Wei. France got her influence recognised over the Port of Kwangchow Wan. In this way almost all the important Powers in Europe except Italy obtained facilities for trade in China. They tried to partition China in their respective spheres of influence and to westernise the Chinese. This produced a strong anti-foreign movement in China. In the Boxer rising of 1900 the German Ambassador was assassinated in Peking, and Sugiyama of the Japanese Legation was beaten to death, and the foreign ministers were asked to leave within 24 hours. This brought on the scene an international relief force under German General Count Waldersee, consisting of Japanese, Russian, British, American, French and German troops. On their arrival at Peking the Chinese Government was forced to enter into a treaty by which China had to pay a heavy indemnity, and to dismantle the forts. Suitable apologies had to be made to Germany and Japan for the deaths of their ministers. The competition of the European Powers in China led England to seek alliance with Japan. The Anglo-Japanese Alliance was signed on January 30, 1902. By this treaty Japan could count upon the help of England against the other European Powers who were menacing her interests. This alliance placed Japan on terms of equality with the greatest of the world empires.

The next stage in the history of Japan is the Russo-Japanese War. She considered Korea as within her sphere of influence and protested against the building of forts by Russia in the Yalu Valley. Russia promised to withdraw, but wasted time in long negotiations which ultimately broke off on February 5, 1904. In the war which lasted till May 1905 Russia was defeated, Port Arthur surrendered and the Russian fleet ruined. At the instance of the United States of America the peace terms were settled at Portsmouth (New Hampshire), on August 23, 1905. The paramountcy of Japan was recognised in Korea. Japan and Russia both agreed to leave Manchuria to China, and Russia transferred

her rights over the Liao-Tung Peninsula, and Port Arthur to Japan, and ceded to her the Southern half of the island of Sakhalien which she had seized in 1875. By this success Japan obtained a position of unquestioned prominence in Asia. The increase of her prestige led England to renew the alliance with her for five years more (August 12, 1915)

Japan now became a strong naval power, and stood no longer in fear of the other European Powers. Russia was humiliated, and France and Germany did not possess strong navy on the Pacific to stand against the combined forces of Japan and England. The statement that "the Pacific is a European lake" does no longer hold good. This was fully demonstrative during the Great War of 1914--18. Japanese forces drove the Germans from their colonies and in the peace treaty the leases and rights held by Germany in China were transferred to her. England now controls the South, through Australia and New Zealand, and Japan the North.

RUSSO-JAPANESE WAR

Q. 61. Discuss the causes and results of the Russo-Japanese War. (P. U. 1920.)

Q. 62. Give the main causes and results of the Russo-Japanese War. (P. U. 1925.)

Q. 63. Narrate the causes and the chief events of the Russo-Japanese War of 1904-1905. What were the political effects of this War (P. U. 1928)

THE CAUSES OF THE WAR

The hostility between Russia and Japan started in 1875, when Russia captured the island of Sakhalien from Japan. The second incident which estranged the feelings of the two Powers was the intervention of Russia along with Germany and France in the affairs of Korea which Japan had obtained after defeating China in 1895. The third event in the series was the occupation of Port Arthur by Russia and converting the port into a naval station in

1898 Russia further strengthened her position by extending the Trans-Siberian Railway into Manchuria. Fourthly Russia obtained the right from China to extend her protectorate over Manchuria (1900). Japan was greatly alarmed at the extension of Russian authority over Manchuria and Korea. She was interested in Korea which she considered lying within her sphere of influence. She therefore protested against the building of forts by Russia in the Yalu Valley.

Russia guaranteed the integrity of Korea and promised to withdraw from Manchuria on the restoration of order in that province. But when instead of returning she was strengthening her military position Japan demanded that a date should be fixed for the evacuation. Negotiations were started in August 1902, and finally broken off in February, 1904.

CHIEF EVENTS OF THE WAR

1. Admiral Togo, in command of the Japanese Fleet, torpedoed the Russian fleet off Port Arthur (February 8-9) and proceeded to invade Korea. Four Russian ships were sunk and the rest bottled up in the harbour of Port Arthur.

2. Vladivostok Fleet was defeated in May.

3. General Kuroki cleared Korea of Russian Troops.

4. General Oku in command of the Second Japanese Army landed on the Liao-Tung Peninsula, cut off communications of the Russians with Port Arthur, and drove the Russians back towards Mukden.

5. Port Arthur surrendered to General Nogi after ten months' siege on January 11, 1905. The casualties in Port Arthur were very heavy. The siege cost them no less than 60,000 in killed and wounded.

6. Reinforced by the troops from Port Arthur General Oku advanced upon Mukden and defeated the Russians at the battle of Mukden (March 6-10) both sides suffered severe loss. In three days' battle 120,000 men

were killed and wounded, and 40,000 Russians were taken as prisoners

7 The Russian Baltic Fleet sailed from the Baltic in October, 1904, fired upon British fishing vessels off Dogger Bank (October 21), which created great excitement in England. The matter was referred to an international commission. Russia apologized to Great Britain and paid compensation to the fishermen. On reaching the Japanese waters the fleet met Admiral Togo who within a few hours sank twenty-two ships and captured six in the Straits of Tsushima (May 27, 1905). This was the last engagement of the War.

8 At the instance of President Roosevelt of the United States of America the representatives of the belligerents met at Portsmouth (New Hampshire) on August 9, 1905. The Treaty was signed on September 5.

RESULTS OF THE WAR

1. Russia restored to Japan the island of Sakhalien which she had captured in 1875.

2 The lease of the Liao-Tung Peninsula and of Port Arthur was surrendered to Japan.

3 Both Japan and Russia agreed to evacuate Manchuria and leave it to China.

4. Korea was declared independent, but it was recognised that it fell within the Japanese sphere of influence.

POLITICAL EFFECTS OF THE WAR

1. The victory of Japan put a definite check upon the advance of Russia and placed Japan in a position of unquestioned pre-eminence.

2 The success of an Eastern Power created a new consciousness in Asia. China tried to follow in the foot-steps of Japan in Europeanising her institutions. The defeat of Russia was taken in India as a blow to the prestige of the European Powers.

3. England renewed her alliance with Japan for five years more (August 12, 1905).

4. The defeat of Russia lowered her in the estimation of the Powers so much that the Triple Alliance of Germany, Austria and Italy changed their policy of defending themselves against France and Russia into a forward policy of expansion.

5. The effect upon Russia was very great. At the beginning of the war she was in a state of internal disorder. The defeat obliged the Tsar to concede to the demands of the people, and hence a form of representative Duma was organised. The Russian Revolution thus received a great impetus through the disasters of Russia.

GLADSTONE'S IRISH POLICY

Q 64 "The policy that he adopted is still a matter of fierce debate." Why is this true of Gladstone's policy in Ireland? (P. U. 1931.)

When Gladstone became Prime Minister in 1868 he defined his Irish policy as one of conciliation. He was resolved to pacify the Irish by removing some of their pronounced grievances. There were three important problems, three branches of the Upas tree as he called them: The Irish Church, the Irish land laws, and Irish education. The Irish Church was an Anglican Church, endowed and established in Ireland since the Reformation. But its members numbered less than one-eighth of the population, the vast majority being Catholic. The Catholics had to pay tithes for the maintenance of the Anglicans while their own priests were exceedingly poor. This was a humiliating situation for the Irish. In 1869 Gladstone got a measure through by which the tithes were abolished, and the Irish Church was dis-established and partly disendowed. The connection of the Irish people with the Church of England ceased from January 1, 1871. This measure was vehemently opposed in

England at the time But Gladstone succeeded in lopping off one branch of the Upas tree

The second branch was the land system. By the Land Act of 1870 the tenant was assured of his right to hold the land as long as he paid the rent, and in case he relinquished his holding he would be compensated for the improvements effected. The law however did not bring peace to Ireland. Landlords managed to evade it, and there were more numerous evictions than ever. But one principle was accepted that the landlord's ownership of the soil was not absolute and unrestricted. The Act of 1870 was the first step in the matter of the improvement of the peasant rights

The third branch referred to the system of education In 1873 Gladstone's Irish University Bill proposed a new University for the whole of Ireland But it was strongly opposed, and on its defeat Gladstone resigned

In his second ministry Gladstone made another attempt to tackle the agrarian problem of Ireland. The Irish Land Act of 1881 was passed with a view to assure the peasant a fair rent, a fixed rent and freedom of sale in addition compensation for improvement already secured. A Land Court was established to fix a judicial rent, which once fixed could not be changed within fifteen years Moreover the tenant could obtain loan from Government to buy out the landlords, and thus became a complete owner himself. But even this measure did not pacify Ireland. A new movement has been started to obtain Home Rule for Ireland

The Home Government Association of Ireland came into existence during first ministry of Gladstone This was reconstituted as the Home Rule League three years later. The Irish demanded a separate Parliament for Irish affairs. The Home Rule party came in larger number to Parliament The Home Rulers accepted the Land Act as a new instalment, and pressed for their further demands with great bitterness They adopted a

policy of intimidation and violence. Notable Government officials in Ireland were assassinated. The Phoenix Park murder in 1882 created a great indignation. In reply Gladstone then adopted strong measures to maintain peace. His new policy was one of conciliatory legislation to be accompanied by stern repression to keep down violence. The Irish Party remained strong in their demands.

Gladstone in his third ministry realised the sincerity of the Irish demands and introduced the Irish Government Bill on April 8, 1886, to be followed by a Land Bill. The Irish were to have a legislature of their own for their own affairs, and they would be excluded from the British Parliament. The land bill proposed to transfer land to the peasants by purchase. These two bills created a fierce struggle. The exclusion of the Irish from the British Parliament was considered by many as snapping the bond of Union. The liberal party was disrupted over this policy. The Bill was thrown out on the second reading by 343 votes against 313. On an appeal to the country Gladstone received a great rebuff, and after the election he resigned.

In 1892 Gladstone came back to power for the fourth time. He introduced a new Home Rule Bill early in 1863. It provided that Ireland should send eighty members to Westminster, but not to vote on questions expressly confined to England and Scotland. But this provision met with stern opposition and then Gladstone agreed that the Irish members would have unconditional right to vote on all matters. The Bill as amended was carried by a small majority of 34 in the Commons but was defeated in the Lords by a heavy majority. Gladstone devoted his attention henceforth to reduce the authority of the Lords.

Gladstone's Irish policy did not receive universal support any time. It was opposed by the Conservatives and the English party in Ireland. Asquith's Irish measures were also stoutly opposed, but he carried them with

the help of the Parliament Act which he brought into existence. This measure had to be still further modified. The Sinn Fein movement gave a new turn, and Ireland has been split up into two, the North Ireland, and the Irish Free State. This has no doubt brought peace, but this division has not satisfied the Irish sentiment fully, because Ireland has been made a geographical expression instead of a national state. Gladstone's policy has still a number of adherents, but the opposition is very great.

MAIN FEATURES OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

Q 65 "The nineteenth century was a century of revolution—revolution in Government, revolution in the material conditions and circumstances of life, revolution in knowledge and in mental outlook." Discuss this statement, giving briefly the special features of the nineteenth century. (P. U. 1928).

The statement that the nineteenth century was a century of revolution is perfectly correct. In this century the outlook of man in every sphere of life has greatly changed. It started with a great movement for the destruction of the authority of the privileged classes, of the old feudal chiefs and the nobility and the extension of the rights of the people. Napoleon gave uniform and settled laws to the people, and helped to develop a sense of love for good government, people began to respect the rights of individuals and also to cherish the desire of organising nation-states. The autocratic rulers combined to bring about the downfall of Napoleon and to suppress the ideals of the French revolution. For a period the reactionary forces succeeded in crushing the liberal movement. But the history of the nineteenth century is a history of the efforts made by the nations to overthrow oppressive autocratic Governments and to set up democratic national constitutional Governments in their place. France was kept under monarchy till 1848, and then a republic was established. Napoleon III upset the republic and once again established a monarchy. But on his fall in 1870 the Republic asserted itself. The Greeks became inde-

pendent in 1829, the Italians carried on their war of liberation, and they succeeded in driving the Austrians from Italy by 1866, and obtaining complete unity in 1870. The Germans have also shaken off their old system of Government. Prussia was the first to grant a constitution, and then to lead the Germans to unity. On the attainment of the unity they succeeded in establishing a regularly constituted Confederation with a systematic form of Government. The other States in Europe have also got their constitutions revised on democratic lines. Almost every state in Europe except Prussia had established the Parliamentary system of Government by the end of the century.

The next feature of the century was the growth of the new spirit of nationalism. The Balkan States within the Ottoman Empire shook off the Turkish rule, and became free. Thus we have independent states of Greece, Serbia, Roumania, Montenegro and Bulgaria coming into existence. The Hungarians and the Czechs also tried to shake off the Austrian rule, but they did not succeed till after the Great War. This was also the case with the Poles who were divided between the Russians, Prussians and Austrians. The sentiment of nationalism of the Italians and Germans was satisfied within the century.

The democratic ideas have captured the imagination of the people. There was not only a strong desire for representative Government, but for the extension of the franchise to every man who has attained majority. England enacted three important Reform measures, in 1832, 1867, 1884. The universal suffrage has been incorporated in the constitutions of almost every important state. The socialist movement started by Louis Blanc and Karl Marx has gained for the working men their rightful place in society. Governments in the beginning tried to reduce the intensity of socialism by welfare movement. Factory Acts in England, or the Insurance measures in Germany were adopted with a view to kill socialism. But the control of the community in the affairs of the state has become inevitable. It is a common thing now to have Labour Governments or socialist

Governments The masses and working men have obtained the predominant voice. If there are any monarchs they have receded into the position of constitutional rulers

So far as the material conditions and circumstances of life are concerned a number of discoveries have enriched the life of man. The invention of steam engine, the construction of steamships and railways, and latterly of electricity and motor power have facilitated easy transportation. Trade and commerce have so developed that no country can now think of growing in isolation. The industries have developed with the help of power, and greater attention is given to mechanical devices. Economic problems are studied with greater care and in the Universities the departments of modern studies and applied sciences have made great progress. The comforts of man have increased with the supply of finished articles produced by machinery. Along with the development of physical sciences, medical knowledge has made great progress and people receive quick remedies for their ailments. Physicians and surgeons can now deal very difficult cases, and use delicate instruments.

The rapid locomotion, the growth of knowledge regarding the different parts of the world, and telegraph, telephone and other systems of communications have changed the mental outlook. People can now form comprehensive ideas of men and events in different parts of the world. There is a growing sense of cooperation among them. There was a time when each nation thought of its exclusive privileges, exclusive rights, and peculiar characteristics. This helped the growth of what is called "Chauvinism." But the scientific progress has removed the illusion.

Towards the last quarter of the century nation-states became big world-wide empires, and with the extension of their territories, and increase in the points of contact with other nations universal ideas have gradually dawned. The movement for comparative study of scriptures, literatures and customs started with the school of positive thinkers,

and it is making steady progress. Side by side with this movement has developed the freedom of conscience movement. Political disabilities on account of holding religious faiths have been removed, and people enjoy their rights irrespective of their creed. The authority of the Pope has also shrunk. He no longer holds temporal power, and education is not dominated by the priests. Individual rights, and individual opinions have gradually been extended and respected. This is indeed a great revolution.

EFFECTS OF THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION

Q. 66. *How far has modern economic and industrial evolution revolutionised the political problem of the old Europe of the ancient regime ?* (P. U. 1920)

In the old Europe the economic system was based upon agriculture and cottage industries. The industrial life was guided by the guild system. The landlord and feudal chief exercised great influence in society, and the king carried on Government with the help of the privileged classes. The common people had no share in the administration. They had to bear all the burden but enjoyed no privilege. The industrial revolution produced by the invention of steam engine developed the factory system. The modern factories are big organisations employing a large number of labourers, and immense capital. The labourers gathered round the factory and introduced new problems in society. The capitalists as a class stand aloof from the labourers. The combination of the labourers has given rise to the new philosophy of Socialism. The distribution of population has been re-arranged, the industrial and commercial centres drawing a larger population. The centre of political activities has consequently shifted to the thickly populated areas. In old order of things labour was dependent upon land, and the land-lord and capitalists maintained the domestic system. Labour under the patronage and protection of capital did not seek freedom. But in the new system labour enjoys an important point in the organisation. The capitalist and the organiser in the beginning would exploit

labour, but better education, and more efficient combination among the working men have made labour an important factor. The ideas of democracy developed in the industrial cities, and from the position of dependence the working men have risen to become the masters. It is by the vote of the working men that the most important political issues are decided. The July Revolution of 1830 was to a great extent influenced by the working men of Paris. The February Revolution of 1848 was caused by the doctrines of socialism preached by Louis Blanc and others. The National workshops, and the doctrine of "right to labour" were the direct results of the industrialised life. With the growth of industrialism the feudal system receded. Cavour started economic and industrial reconstruction as a necessary preparation for political progress. The economic and commercial unity in Germany provided political unity, and the industrial progress has thus brought about the dawn of new democracy. Russian Government remained autocratic till the people learnt the advantages of industrial organisation. The industrial development started by the end of the nineteenth century has produced a new upheaval, and the despotic rulers had to submit to the forces of modern society.

Political system is determined by the economic condition of the people. When the common people cannot combine they submit to the authority of despots, but when combination is effective Government is carried on according to the wishes of the people. There has therefore been a march from autocracy to democracy according to the process of industrial evolution.

In England the industrial revolution necessitated the reforms in 1832, 1867, 1884, and 1918. With the growth of the influence of labour the representative system has made immense progress. The same process is witnessed in other countries. The industrial progress has made the world trade a necessary link in the process of development. The output of industries have to be sold abroad, the increased income produced increased population, and the surplus

population went to the thinly settled lands outside Europe. The competition of the countries in the field of commerce has drawn them together to consider their political problems in a spirit of cooperation. The ruin of one country leads to depression in trade, and prosperity increases the wealth of another. The industrially advanced countries are bound together in a bond of fellowship to promote each other's interests. Inventions of science, rapid locomotion through steam and electricity, have increased the links of cooperation. These new points of contact have necessitated the consideration of the political problems from the standpoint of wider interests. The powers dictated to Germany that she must have responsible Government. These powers again have agreed to help Germany in her economic difficulties. The old idea of growing in isolation is now superseded, and people seek for help from others in their political and economic difficulties.

NEW POLITICAL THEORIES

Q 67 Give some account of the new political theories which became prominent in Europe during the latter half of the nineteenth century. *(P. U. 1930)*

The theories of socialism, nationalism, and constitutionalism were very prominent during the middle of the nineteenth century, and their force was in operation even towards the end. The socialism demands the control of the means of production by the community in the interest of the workers. It denies the private ownership of capital and desires the community to become the owner of all property. It is a protest against the capitalist system which employed labour as a mere tool of production, and paid wages to the working men according to the principle of the equation of supply and demand. Labour is not a commodity to be bartered, according to the socialists. It is the most important factor in production, and it must have the determining voice in the distribution of profits. The socialism was a phase of the movement for freedom which demanded sovereignty of the people as the panacea of all evils. It was developed in different forms in different countries, and by

different schools of thinkers. The most prominent writer on socialism was Karl Marx who in his *Capital* gave an exposition of his philosophy. His book published in 1867 is considered as the Gospel of socialism. The cardinal principles of his philosophy are that society is divided into antagonistic groups, bourgeoisie or capitalists and proletariat or working men, and that in the struggle the working class will win by uniting against the capitalist class by transferring ownership of property to the nation or state which should control the means of production for the benefit of the whole people. In pursuance of these principles an appeal was made to the working men to unite, and the First International (The International Association of working men) was formed in London in 1864, for the purpose of coordinating and systematising the work of various socialistic societies. The International succeeded in educating the opinion of working men about their vital problems.

This doctrine of Internationalism failed on account of the opposition of two school of thinkers, the Anarchists led by Bakunin, and Nationalists who were holding the field. Bakunin did not believe in King, Government or Religion. He urged violence as the means of remedying all social evils. His doctrine was not employed by many, and the party was driven out of the International. The Socialist party had a wing of nationalists led by Ferdinand Lassale. He was the founder of the National Socialism in Germany. His fundamental idea was that only through the acquisition of political power could the social revolution be effected. He aimed at universal suffrage as the means by which Government would be forced to invest money in National Workshops. Another party called the Social Democrat was formed under the leadership of Liebknecht. The two parties were fused in a Labour Congress at Gotha in 1875. This Congress had great international influence. Bismarck was compelled by the growth of the influence of the Socialists to devote his attention to the interests of the working men.

In Russia the oppression of the despotic Tsar produced a new thought among the educated people. The intellectuals were in revolt against despotism and superstitions. They were extreme individualists who tested every human institution and customs by reason. As the Russian institutions failed the test of reason they condemned them all and therefore were called Nihilists. In the name of individual liberty Nihilism denied any obligation to society, family life or religion. Their propaganda was destructive and the Russian Government took strong measures to suppress them.

The theory of Nationalism which had its rise early in the century remained very strong throughout the century. It brought about the national revival in Italy, Germany, and Balkan States. The Poles tried very hard to revive their national state. The spirit of nationalism by which a people with a common tradition and homogeneous culture and with links of unity through language and racial characteristics is sustained is a dynamic influence. The revolutions in the nineteenth century were caused mainly by this doctrine.

The idea of national unity was confronted by the forces of particularism in the individual states of Germany. These States were brought to accept a single organisation by the device of federation. The individual states did not lose their identity, or separate existence, and they retained full power to determine the general policy of the federal state. The German Empire stood the test of federation and afforded an example of a state which maintained unity without sacrificing diversity. The Federal idea was also embodied in the Swiss constitution. The Cantons have given up their separatist tendencies, and have gradually strengthened the federation by conceding their old privileges.

In the British Empire Disraeli developed the doctrine of Imperialism. When he purchased the shares in the Suez Canal from the Khedive he acquired territories for his

own country. Other European countries adopted the same principle. Every nation wanted expansion in the less developed parts of the world. This lust for territory had been called Imperialism. The Liberals were opposed to this view and they generally stood by the principle of the freedom of nations. Gladstone for example stood by the rights of the smaller nationalities. He also did not support the policy of coercing the Boers. In the second half of the nineteenth century we find in the British Empire the grant of responsible government to some of the dominions. This idea of making the distant territories autonomous was opposed by the Imperialists. But the Liberals led by Gladstone would even make Ireland an autonomous state.

INFLUENCE OF OTHER COUNTRIES UPON EUROPE.

Q. 68. Show how events outside Europe influenced the course of European politics 1900 – 1914. (*P. U. 1930*)

The first event which drew the attention of the Powers at the beginning of the twentieth century was the Boer War. The Dutch settlers in South Africa were engaged in war with the British Government. The sympathy of the European Powers was with the Boers, and Germany showed a distinct anti-British sentiment. In the Far East the European Powers and Japan were busy in suppressing the anti-foreign rebellion in China, known as the Boxer Rebellion. The foreign armies were in occupation of Shantung for about a year, till at last China had to pay a heavy indemnity on account of the situation in China. England tried to define the policy of the Powers in the East. An agreement was signed between Germany and England on October 16, 1900, by which they guaranteed the integrity of China, and maintained the policy of "open door" in Commerce. The German minister Bulow later on explained that this agreement applied only to the Yangtse-Kian Valley, and not to Manchuria. This added to the attitude of the Kaiser towards the Boers showed that the Germans were not anxious for English friendship. England in order to strengthen her position in the East entered

into an alliance with Japan (1902). The Russo Japanese War (1904-1905) further complicated European politics. It changed the policy of the European Powers. The Triple alliance of Germany, Austria-Hungary and Italy which had till then followed the policy of defending themselves against France and Russia now adopted a forward policy of expansion. France and Russia were bound by the Dual Alliance of 1894 to defend each other. England was by the end of the nineteenth century following an independent course. The German policy at this time was one of vacillation. But England was anxious to seek some ally. Italy entered into a secret understanding with France (June 4, 1902) and declared that the Triple Alliance was not directed against France. In the Russo-Japanese War Germany might have supported Russia, if England had joined the Japanese.

The relations between France and England were not very cordial on account of the incidents in Egypt and Fashoda. But the differences were approached in a friendly spirit by Lord Lansdowne and M. Delcasse in 1904. They came to an understanding and it was agreed that France would not question the rights of England in Egypt, as England would not challenge the rights of France in Morocco. They also came to an understanding about the questions in Newfoundland, Siam, and West Africa. The two rival nations became friends, and the *Entente Cordiale* had great effect in international affairs. This 'Entente' was extended to Russia in 1907 when England entered into an agreement with her regarding Persia, Afghanistan and Tibet. These affairs outside Europe thus helped the formation of a strong combination of England, France and Russia.

Assured of the support of England France began to increase her control over Morocco (1905). Germany wanted to check this growing influence. The German Chancellor Bulow demanded the continuance of the "open door" and the integrity of the political status of the Sultan of Morocco. The Kaiser came on a visit to Tangier in

March 31, and then declared that he recognised the sovereignty and independence of the Sultan. Following upon this he demanded an International Conference to consider the question. M. Delcasse opposed the proposal, but at the instance of President Roosevelt of U. S. A. the Conference met in Algieras (January 1906). In the deliberations of the Conference France was greatly supported by England, and the Entente practically developed into an alliance. Morocco once again came into prominence in 1911. A rebellion of the tribesmen made the interference of France necessary. The despatch of the French troops to Morocco was considered by Germany as a violation of the Algieras Act and the Morocco pact. The German gunboat *Panther* was despatched to Agadir (July 1, 1911) with the ostensible object of affording protection to the Europeans there, but their main intention was to put pressure upon France. England once again came to support France, and then an agreement was made between the Powers. The War was averted by the attitude of England. In the meantime Italy had occupied Tripoli and twelve islands in the Aegean.

These events further helped the Entente of France and England. In 1912 a Naval Convention was signed by which the defence of the Mediterranean was left to France while England undertook to defend the English Channel and the North Sea. Europe was divided into two big groups, Germany prepared for War by building a strong navy, as a counter-move to the combination of France and England.

NEW POLITICAL THEORIES OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY.

Q. 69. Carefully analyse the new Political and Social theories which have affected Europe in the Twentieth century.

(P. U. 1931),

The main idea in the minds of the powerful nations in the beginning of the twentieth century was that it was the best nation, and that it was destined to be the predominant force in the history and civilization of the world.

This has been called the spirit of Imperialism. This arrogance is to be found among the Powers having vast colonies abroad. A great Power must "think in continents," try to spread its own ideas of civilization, and adopt means of increasing its economic wealth. This doctrine of national greatness at the expense of other peoples was most vigorously put in the Teutonic countries. One English statesman said, "The Anglo-Saxon race is infallibly destined to be the predominant force in the history and civilization of the world." So did Kaiser Wilhelm II say: "God has called us to civilize the world." In the name of civilizing the backward countries the principal nations of Europe entered the foreign lands, and in some cases to justify their action they said that they were "trustees" of the peoples under their care. This idea has developed into the system of Mandates. Corresponding to the idea of Imperialism is German *Welt-politik*. Germany tried to extend her influence through the world, and it is believed that the ambitions of establishing the world-states brought about the Great War in 1914.

The German thinkers like Nietzsche, Treitschke and Bernhardi greatly influenced the people by their new ideas. Bernhardi developed the doctrine of "superman." The superman is a being of a higher race than man. He is endowed with indomitable will-power, but without any pity or sympathy for others as that leads to weakness. A race of supermen can become the Lords of the earth. The Prussian autocracy was obsessed with this idea. Treitschke wrote that the existence of a state depended upon war, and war united a nation and was the only remedy for an ailing nation. He further stressed the importance of a colonial empire. General Von Bernhardi went further and said that "War was a biological necessity," and that only by the development of its military strength to the highest degree of efficiency could a nation rise to the acme of its greatness and power. These ideas went deep into the hearts of the people, and attempts to settle the international differences failed on account of the Megalomania from which the nations suffered.

The Great War brought into view a number of other theories. The English Prime Minister Asquith in justification of the English participation in the War declared that they were going to fight to maintain the integrity of the smaller nationalities. Belgium and Serbia were threatened by Germany and Austria. The neutrality of Belgium had been guaranteed by the Powers, and Germany had foolishly considered the treaty guaranteeing the neutrality as a "mere scrap of paper." It was to maintain the integrity of Morocco that Germany despatched the *Panther* to Agadir and now England declared war against Germany in the interest of Belgium and Serbia.

Another theory which was urged towards the conclusion of the War was the doctrine of "Self-determination." There were a number of races still under the control of other nations. Poland was governed by Russia, Prussia and Austria; Hungary, Bohemia, Trieste and Fiume were under Austria-Hungary, and Lithuania, Finland and other provinces were governed by Russia. The principle of self-determination would be extended to these submerged peoples. Parts of German districts were allowed the plebiscite at the end of the war in pursuance of this doctrine.

The doctrine of "Responsible Government" was enforced by the victors in the case of Germany and the conquered countries. The Kaiser was forced to resign and Republics were established in most of the countries because people felt that the nation should be identified with the Government in such a way that the will of one man might not bring about a war. The idea of nationalism was fully accepted, and a new system of international cooperation in maintaining the peace of the world was definitely accepted by all the Powers. The League of Nations has been established with the object of deciding the international quarrels by means of arbitration. The Hague Peace Conferences were informal meetings, but the Peace Treaty of 1919 included the League of Nations as a machinery for maintaining peace and promoting the welfare of the world. Thus in place of rivalry and competition we have

now the principles of cooperation and consultation. Further the craze for increasing the military strength has given place to the talk of disarmament. Many nations have entered into agreement to reduce their army and navy and to give up war as a means of settling disputes. They no longer talk of "preparedness for war as the best method of avoiding war".

In social life there is still the conflict between capital and labour. The capitalists believe in the doctrine of *Laissez faire* and open competition, but labour requires state control of the means of production and fixing of the minimum rates of wages by the Government. A new phase of labour movement organised in France in the beginning of the century was the syndicalism or direct action by the group of labourers in particular branches of industries. Labour adopted the plan of intimidation, boycott and strikes to gain its objects. The direct action has no doubt lost its force now, but for some time syndicalism was resorted to as the means of solving labour problems. Labour has gained its point by the adoption of universal suffrage almost in every important state. Women also have got their political rights recognised. A new force in Russia has been the Bolshevism, a phase of socialism which demanded the establishment of a Government based upon the *soviets* or local committees as units. The Bolsheviks wanted to achieve their object by complete revolution and were not afraid of using force. They profess communistic views preached by Karl Marx, and have kept the political franchise restricted to the industrial *proletariat*. Labour has their complete authority in the state established by the Bolsheviks.

Another phase of life is Fascism which is developing in Italy. It is guided by Mussolini, who says: "The state is the central idea of our movement, it is the political and juridical organisation of national societies, and evolves in a series of institutions of various kinds. Our formula is this: "every thing in the state, nothing outside the state, and nothing against the state." This system of an all-powerful

state militates against individual rights which people desire so much. The Bolshevism on the other hand is a communistic doctrine which reduces the individual to the dominance of the community.

GERMANY A MENACE TO EUROPE.

Q. 70. How far is it true that from 1901, in an ever-increasing degree, Germany became a menace to the unity of Europe and the peace of the world (P. U. 1925).

The talk of an Anglo-German agreement closed in 1906 when the German Minister Bulow rejected the British offer. The German view was that by an alliance with England Germany would have to fight with France and Russia, while England would be busy extending her colonial empire by picking up unconsidered trifles in Asia and Africa. Germany has nothing to gain by this alliance, as her progress, colonial, commercial and naval was bound to inconvenience England. The Germans believed that a struggle between Germany and England was sooner or later bound to come. The Kaiser had already launched a scheme of naval armament to prepare for this situation.

During the Boer War the German sentiment was in sympathy with the Boers, but the German Government remained neutral. The apprehensions of a war on that account were removed by the attitude of the Government. But Germany was ambitious of dominating the Near East, and for this purpose obtained concessions from the Sultan to build a rail road to Bagdad. This upset England and Russia who considered the expansion of German influence as a menace to their respective spheres of influence. The fear of German influence led England and Russia to negotiate the Anglo-Russian Convention (1907). England had already entered into a friendly understanding with France in 1904 regarding the respective spheres of influence in Egypt and Morocco. The Anglo-French *Entente* excited the jealousy of Germany, she found that failing to obtain German friendship England had accepted the French alliance. The Kaiser therefore was anxious to nullify this

Edward VII. He was willing to combine with the Tsar safeguarding their interests in the Baltic against the British. But the Russian ministers were not informed of such a combination. On the other hand the *Entente* was strengthened by the Anglo-Russian Convention. Germany felt herself encircled by the Triple *Entente*. She had been out-manceuvred by England and her friends. In the affairs of Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1908 Germany paid Russia in her own coin. Austria was allowed to annex these two Slav provinces silently, and Russia could not protest. The Bosnian crisis gave a great impetus to the war spirit in the Balkans, and improved the position of Pan-Germanism. Germany tried to further improve her position by an agreement with France over Morocco (1909) and with Russia regarding their interests in Mesopotamia and Persia (1910). But another great crisis confronted Europe when Germany sent the gunboat *Panther* to Agadir in protest against the French advance upon the capital of Morocco (1911). The German policy was guided by two ideas, to impose upon France, a diplomatic humiliation, and to drive a wedge into the Triple *Entente*. The attitude of England averted a war. Germany was humiliated, but the feeling grew strong that by the German sword the peace of Europe would be maintained. She could not brook the rise of England as the arbiter of the world.

In a way therefore it is true that from 1901, in an ever-increasing degree, Germany became a menace to the unity of Europe, and the peace of the world. She was anxious to bring about a rupture between France and England, and between France and Russia. By supporting Austria in the annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina she increased the strength of the Pan-Slav movement. She was anxious for a war over Morocco. But the other powers were also not absolutely pacific in their attitude. The Triple *Entente* had certainly in view the object of "encircling" Germany.

CONFLICT OF GERMANY AND GREAT BRITAIN.

Q 71. What are the main causes which led Germany to plunge into war in 1914-1915 ? Examine the statement that "Sooner or later, war between Great Britain and Germany was inevitable." (P. U. 1920).

The immediate cause which dragged Germany into the war was the Austro German Alliance. Germany was bound to support Austria in case of a war between the latter and a third power. The murder of the Austrian Archduke Franz Ferdinand at Sarajevo on June 28, 1914, was instigated by Serbia, and Serbia could not satisfy the Austrian demands. War was declared by Austria upon Serbia which was a Slav country. Russia took up the cause of Serbia, and Germany declared war against Russia according to the terms of the Austro-German Alliance, later confirmed by the Triple Alliance.

Russia came into the field because of the propaganda of Pan-Slavism. She had entered into a friendly agreement with France and England, and on Russia being involved in war France as an ally of Russia declared war against her enemy. England was bound by the Anglo-French Agreement to defend the North Sea and the English Channel. Germany was aware of this combination of Russia, France and England. She had been humiliated by France in the Morocco affair, and Russia bore a grudge against her on account of her support to Austria in annexing Bosnia-Herzegovina. England was a great rival of Germany in the political as well as commercial spheres. It was on account of the strong support of England that France could defy Germany. Since 1871 Germany became the most powerful state in Europe. She had the best trained army. She rose quickly as an industrial country, and her trade and commerce made rapid progress. She also acquired vast territories. But England was her greatest rival in these fields. England maintained her supremacy on account of her sea-power. Germany also built up a strong navy and since the Moroccan incident

that Germany might support Russia, in that case England might have gone to help Japan. But that emergency did not arise. The tension between England and Germany was growing very strong, the German sentiment was in favour of an early war so that Germany might obtain her proper place on earth. The war-fever was of course not confined to Germany. France was smarting under the loss of Alsace and Lorraine, and the German interference in Morocco increased that bitterness. England might be prevailed upon to fight for the sake of France, if not in her own interest. One of the greatest forces at work was Pan-Germanism which had a fourfold object; a defensive movement for self-preservation, an offensive movement having for its object the seizure of the English possessions in the Mediterranean and in Asia, a world-wide naval supremacy, and *Welt-politik* or world power. Germany wanted to develop her Colonial Empire, to outrival Great Britain in commerce, and to create a strong imperial navy. The aspirations of Germany were strongly put before the nation by the writers, teachers and interpreted by the historians. The idea of German superiority was spread in every possible way. This was a blow to the British prestige, and naturally the British people cherished a desire to maintain their position in face of this competition. A clash was therefore inevitable sooner or later.

THE GREAT WAR.

Q. 72 Illustrate the main features of the European political situation which were directly responsible for the Great War of 1914 and explain how they were changed as the result of it.
(P. U. 1930.)

The historian Gooch says: "The root of the evil lay in the division of Europe into two armed camps, which dated from 1871, and the conflict was the offspring of fear no less than of ambition. The old world had degenerated into a powder magazine, in which the dropping of a lighted match whether by accident or design, was

stood in the way of both, and both the Powers tried to enlist the support of the newly created States. Russia stood as the defender of the Slavs of Europe, and therefore obtained the ready cooperation of Serbia who wanted to unite all the Slavs against the tyranny and encroachment of Austria. Within the Austrian Empire there was a large number of Slavs clamouring for organising themselves into a national State.

The internal situation in Austria—Hungary was complicated. The Austrian Empire consisted of many races speaking different languages, and professing diverse faiths. There were twelve million Germans in Austria, ten million Magyars in Hungary, twenty-five million Slavs scattered from North to South, three million Roumanians in Transylvania and one million Italians on the Adriatic. The Magyars obtained a separate Government in the Dual Monarchy since 1867, but the other races were dissatisfied. The Czechs in Bohemia demanded the same rights as the Magyars, but their claims remained unheeded. The Slavs were denied any right to manage their own affairs. The racial problems kept the Empire in a state of turmoil. The annexation of Bosnia—Herzegovina in 1908 added to the confusion by increasing the numbers of the Slavs who did not like to submit to the Magyar rule. The Hungarians also demanded fuller control over their own affairs, and wanted an army of their own. To save the Empire from internal dissensions and to win for Austria a place in the world she developed the policy of aggression. The alliance with Germany enabled her in maintaining good relations with Bulgaria and Turkey, and also to keep down the opposition of Roumania with regard to Transylvania. Russia, in order to gain the support of Austria in the matter of the Straits raised no objection to the annexation of Bosnia. But this event increased the tension between Serbia and Austria. Serbia had formed the idea of a greater Serbia with Slavs in her neighbourhood. Her ambitions brought about the Balkan War in 1912-13, but the Bucharest Settlement created the

State of Albania which shut Serbia off from the Sea. She, therefore, exploited the discontent of the Slav subjects of the Austrian Emperor and called them to rally round her to bring about a strong Slav State. In this object she was encouraged by Russia who greatly resented the Austrian failure to help her in getting a passage to the Mediterranean. The antagonism between Serbia and Austria formed the main factor in the Great tragedy.

Serbia desired a revision of the Treaty of Bucharest, a commission was appointed to fix the boundaries of Albania but the commission could not make any progress as the Greeks, Serbians and Montenegrins put innumerable obstacles in their way. Serbian Troops reoccupied Albanian territory and would not withdraw even after receiving warning from Austria. Germany assured Austria of her support. Confident of assistance from Germany, Austria sent an ultimatum to Belgrade (October 17-18, 1913). Warnings also came from other Powers. Serbia had therefore no other alternative than to evacuate Albania. The success of the Austrian ultimatum without the intervention of Powers had its effect upon the future conduct of the diplomatic relations. Austria felt that direct action was more effective than an international conference.

It has been clearly analysed by a Russian diplomatist who wrote in a secret report to the Tsar in December 1913: "Two factors play a great role in the instability of the present situation in the Balkans. The first is Austria-Hungary, with the manifest increase of the nationalist movement caused by the success of the Serbs and the Roumanians, and the effect of these successes upon their racial brothers within the frontiers of the Hapsburg Monarchy. The second factor is that it is impossible for Bulgaria to resign herself to the painful results of the Treaty of Bucharest" In view of this situation Russia thought that to obtain possession of the Straits war with Germany and Austria was inevitable. The situation in the Near East was electric, and the necessary spark came from Sarajevo.

The war has solved some of these problems. In spite of its defects the Peace Treaty marks a landmark in the history of Europe. The oppressed smaller nationalities were constituted into independent States, the autocratic empires of Russia, Austria-Hungary and Germany have been destroyed, and the problems of the Balkans have been settled in the interest of the peoples concerned. There is no longer the menace of Russia towards the Straits, or of Austria towards Salonica. The Slavs have been liberated. The Czecho-Slovaks, the Yugo-Slavs, and the Roumanians have got their desired states. Hungary has been separated from Austria, and some of the old-standing problems also have been settled, *e.g.*, Alsace and Lorraine, have gone to France. Poland has got its freedom. The autocratic States of Russia and Germany which were responsible for most of the troubles in Europe have been converted into republics. All the powers have now agreed to submit their differences for arbitration by an international body like the League of Nations. Secret diplomacy has disappeared, and every small State has its place on the Assembly of the League. The situation has then considerably changed. In place of jealousy there is a spirit of cooperation.

Q 73. What were the chief results of the Great War of 1914—18, and how far are they likely to be of permanent effect in European history? (*P. U. 1931*).

At the end of the war the Powers met in Conference in Paris and their deliberations ended in the Treaty of Versailles (June 28, 1919). Germany was made to cede Alsace-Lorraine to France, Eupen, Malmedy, and part of Moresnet to Belgium, Memel to Lithuania, greater portion of West Prussia and East Silesia to Poland, a portion of Upper Silesia to Czecho-Slovakia, and Danzig was created a "free city." The territories on the German border such as the Saar Basin, Schleswig, portions of East and West Poland, and Upper Silesia were given the right to decide by a plebiscite with which country they would be associated. German

colonies were distributed amongst France, England, Belgium and Japan, and her leases and rights in China were transferred to Japan. Germany was forced to surrender her navy, and to abolish compulsory military service. Her army was reduced to 100,000 men and her powers of producing war materials and aircrafts were restricted. All forts on the Rhine and in Heligoland were destroyed, and the Kiel canal was opened to all nations. Besides these hard terms Germany had to pay a heavy indemnity and was required to surrender her merchantmen and smaller crafts.

The chief plank of the Treaty of Versailles was the provision regarding the League of Nations. Separate treaties were signed with the other Powers, such as the Treaty of St. Germain's with Austria, of Neuilly with Bulgaria, of Trianon with Hungary, of Sevres with Turkey. By the Treaty of St. Germain's (September 10, 1919) Austria was separated from Hungary, a new independent State was formed with Bohemia, Moravia and Austrian Silesia, Western Galicia was added to Poland, and Eastern Galicia to the Ruthenes of the Ukraine. Bukovina was ceded to Roumania. Before the end of the war Poland, Czecho-Slovakia and Yugo-Slavia had already come into existence. Their boundaries were settled by treaty. The old state of Serbia was enlarged into the new State of Yugo-slavia, with Montenegro, Bosnia, Herzegovina and Dalmatia added to it. Trentino with Tyrol, and Istria with Trieste were ceded to Italy. Austria became a small land-locked state, and cannot join Germany without the consent of the League of Nations. Roumania received Transylvania, the Bukovina, half the Banat, and Bessarabia. Greece extended her territories by gaining the Aegean Sea board from Bulgaria and Thrace up to the Chatala lines from Turkey. Russia had already been broken up, and a number of independent states arose on the Baltic such as Lithuania, Latvia, Esthonia, and Finland.

Besides these territorial redistribution and the rise of a number of small independent states the results of the

war may be thus summarised. France became the most important state in Europe. She not only obtained Alsace and Lorraine but obtained control over the richest iron-beds of Europe. Italy also got her territories extended. The Austrian empire collapsed and it was split up into Czecho-Slovakia, Austria, Hungary, and Yugo-Slavia, while parts went to Italy, Poland and Roumania. The Empire of the Tsar of Russia collapsed, and a number of republics rose on its ruins. Poland became an independent state once again. Before the war two-third of Europe had been ruled by autocratic rulers. These autocratic states were reorganised as democratic republics, Germany, Austria-Hungary, Czecho-Slovakia, Poland, and Finland have become republics. The lands controlled by the old landholding classes passed into the hands of the peasants. The best result is the recognition that the problems raised at Paris can only be solved by a permanent international organization. The League of Nations established by the Treaty is an institution of permanent value. The peace of the world can no longer be disturbed by petty private quarrels.

The collapse of the autocratic governments and the rise of democratic states are no mean achievements for humanity. Europe stands transformed, and in place of the division into armed camps the states are joined together in one organisation for the promotion of peace and human welfare.

RUSSIAN REVOLUTION.

Q. 74. From your knowledge of the economic and social condition of Russia explain the causes of the Revolution of 1917.
(*P. U 1930*).

Russia was in a state of economic distress. Down to the middle of the nineteenth century the peasants were in the position of serfs. The reforms introduced by Tsar Alexander improved their status but the economic condition of the peasants hardly improved till the Tsar in a

mood of generosity cancelled all the arrears of taxes in 1904. The economic emancipation of the serfs was followed by a series of reforms. Local self-government was developed in the district and provincial councils (Zemstvos). The policy of industrialisation started in by Serge J. Witte towards the end of the nineteenth century had transformed the life of the people. The industries made rapid progress, the factories drew the peasants from the field, and changed the entire outlook of the people. But Government got alarmed at the combination of labourers at the industrial centres. The workingmen formed their Unions and organised strikes. The liberal ideas spread among these men in new surroundings.

With the growth of industrialisation of Russia there spread the ideas of socialism and communism. The famine in 1904-05 brought about a revolution, and the Tsar conceded a representative Duma. But the powers conceded to this Assembly were insufficient. The Tsar resisted the demands of a responsible ministry, a liberal system of agrarian law. The old privileged classes still retained their full control. The reactionary policy of repression continued, and thousands of Russians were executed or banished for offences against the State.

In the Great War the Government of the Tsar had recruited a large number of troops from the peasantry. But these troops were very poor and could not stand against the strong Teutons. Corruption and indiscipline brought about a state of confusion. Charges of incompetence and dishonesty were made against officials. The leading members of the Duma pressed for a responsible ministry, and the army and the people supported their demand. The autocratic Tsar under the advice of the Grand Dukes and the privileged nobility did not pay any heed to them. There was no middle class in Russia to interpret the views of the people to the ruling classes. The mass of the people were illiterate, they were a ready prey to superstition and propaganda. Peasants torn from their land to fight for a Tsar who could neither feed nor arm them, were

utterly war weary. People suffered from a shortage of food, fuel and clothing, and famine devastated the country. Government was indifferent to their miseries which were increased by the severe winter of 1916-17. In February 100,000 working men went on strike in Petrograd and 25,000 men in Moscow. In their acute food crisis starving persons carried raids on bakeries. The soldiers refused to fire upon the raiders, and the Dumas which was ordered to be dissolved refused to obey the orders. The revolution took a serious turn when 3,00,000 troops went over to the people. A Provisional Government was set up by the Dumas, and the Tsar was asked to abdicate, which he did on March 15.

On the fall of the Tsar the whole structure of Russian autocracy fell with a crash to the ground, a Republic was proclaimed, and an effort was made to establish order at home and to continue the war at the Front. But the forces against this policy were very strong. The socialists who controlled the local committees or *Soviets*, demanded not only economic, social and political revolution at home but peace abroad. They would continue the war only if the allies fought on the principle of a "peace without annexation or indemnities, and based on the right of nations to decide their own affairs." They demanded the revision of their imperialistic secret treaties. This brought about the fall of the Provisional Government under the constitutional Democrats. Thus the Revolution was completed by the Socialists on November 7, 1917. The new party was led by Lenin whose programme included democratic peace, abolition of the rights of the landlords, control of industry by the workers, and the establishment of Soviet Government. This was a reaction of the old autocratic rule. The revolution was thus caused by economic distress, and the misrule of the old privileged classes. The Socialistic and Communistic ideas brought about the overthrow of the autocrats.

NEW EGYPT.

Q. 75. Give a brief sketch of the history of Egypt since 1915. (P. U. 1928).

Since 1882 the British have obtained control over Egypt which acknowledged the Sultan of Turkey as the Suzerain. During the Great War it was realised that the Suez Canal formed one of the most vital points. The Porte had joined the enemy of the British and the Egyptian sentiment was to join the Turks. To ensure safety of the Suez Canal and to prevent the Egyptians joining the Turks Egypt was declared a British Protectorate (December 18, 1914) and the Khedive Abbas II was deposed. The Suzerain rights of Turkey were ignored and Hussein Kamel was recognised as the new ruler with the title of Sultan.

This action of the British Government was greatly resented by the nationalists, who found that the British instead of withdrawing which they had been promising long since were strengthening their hold. There was also great sympathy felt for the Sultan of Turkey who was also the head of the Moslem world as Caliph. The nationalist risings were however easily suppressed by the British, and two attempts made by Turkey and Germany to capture the Suez and to invade Egypt were repulsed. Unsuccessful attempts were made on the life of the new Sultan of Egypt.

Towards the end of the war the Egyptian Nationalists were greatly stirred by the enunciation of the doctrine of self-determination. They considered themselves fully competent to manage their own affairs. But the attitude of the British Government was not encouraging to their aspirations. The British had no intention of abandoning their position. The Egyptians on the other hand demanded complete independence, control of the Sudan, and neutralisation of the Suez Canal. The Powers assembled in the Peace Conference recognised the British Protectorate,

and Turkey had also to agree to it. The disappointed nationalists carried on a vigorous campaign against the British, but the British took strong measures against them. The nationalist leader Zaghlul Pasha with three of his associates were arrested in March, 1919 and deported to the island of Malta. The repressive policy further complicated the situation. The Egyptians throughout the country rose in revolt against the British authority. The contented fellahin who had been treated very harshly during the war, and had to render forced labour became impatient of the strong rule, and joined the nationalists. The situation in March 1919 was very grave. The British Government managed to quell the disturbances, but realised that some reforms were necessary. A Commission under the chairmanship of Lord Milner was appointed to inquire into the situation and to propose a form of Government best calculated to promote peace and prosperity in Egypt. The Commission was boycotted by the Egyptians, and its report was not favourably received. The situation instead of improving became worse. Lord Allenby, High Commissioner in Egypt then represented that either Egypt should be granted independence, or should be annexed to the British Empire by force. The Government saw the logic of his view and declared Egypt as an independent Sovereign State and proclaimed Sultan Ahmed Fuad as king of Egypt. This was, however, a half-measure, as the arrangements regarding the Suez Canal, regarding England's communications with India and the East, regarding the defence of Egypt and the protection of foreigners and foreign interests were not settled. The British Government also have not abandoned the control of the Sudan. Only British Protectorate has been abolished, but Egypt still does not enjoy complete independence.

NATION.

Q. 76. What, in your opinion, are indispensable factors which constitute a 'Nation' ? (P. U. 1925)

Q. 77. What are the distinctive marks of a nation ?

What, in your opinion, are essential and indispensable factors for the development of national sentiment ?

(P. U. 1920).

A nation is an organised people with community of race, language and territory, and possessing a common historical tradition. But none of these are indispensable factors. The chief thing in a nation is that the members of a homogeneous group of people should cherish the sentiment of belonging to the same group. They should rejoice at the triumph of the group, should feel aggrieved at its troubles, try to maintain its honour and dignity at the cost of their lives, should work for it, live for it, die for it and fight for it. A common territory, common language or common creed are desirable but not indispensable. There are nations scattered all over the world, *e. g.*, the Jews. These Jews have a common language, and a common creed, but no common territory. They have however one force which binds them together, it is that they belonged to the same race, and all of them are anxious to come back to their old home. They all believe that they belong to a chosen race of God. These sentiments have kept them together. They stand by the teachings of Moses and the Old Testament.

Switzerland is an example of nation which consists of different races, such as Germans, Italians and French, different creeds such as Protestants and Catholics but the Swiss are bound by a strong love of the Commonwealth. The peoples speak different languages, but they are united in maintaining the honour and dignity of their Republic.

The people living in the United States of America have come from different countries, they profess different faiths, and speak different languages, but they are bound

by the loyalty to the land they live in. The American nation is a new nation, with one hope of the future, and guided by the love of the country and the republic. All those people have not the common historical tradition. They care more for the future than for the past.

The distinctive marks of a nation are very difficult to notice. Generally speaking a group having the common tradition of origin and historical development, common literature, common sufferings, common hopes, and common sentiments living in the same territory may be called a nation. Nationalism is a very strong sentiment. It is strengthened by the sense of a common heritage and common aspirations. This sentiment united the Italians, Germans and Poles. Greece recovered her freedom by this sentiment. The Slavs in the Near East struggled hard to organise their national state. They were inspired by the thought that they were once great and that they could grow as a nation if they were organised as a free United State. Each nation believes that it has certain distinctive features, and it can make its own contribution to the culture and civilization of the world. The love of the country and the nation is known as patriotism. When the Germans were humiliated by Napoleon the Prussians were awakened to the consciousness of belonging to a great nation. This new consciousness was expressed through literature and other national institutions. The nationalism was the most powerful force in the nineteenth century and brought about a number of wars and revolutions. People belonging to the same nation can develop themselves and grow in culture if they live within one geographical area, and are governed by one Government. The Italians lived in one geographical area, but their Governments were different. Their sense of nationalism was not satisfied till they came under one Government. The most important factor therefore is the common sentiment of nationality which finds its expression in different forms according to local circumstances.

POLAND.

Q. 78. Outline the main events in the history of Poland from 1815 to 1918. (*P U 1931*).

Tsar Alexander came to the Congress of Vienna with a determination to restore the independent Kingdom of Poland, to be connected with Russia by formal union with the Crown. But he could not get Prussia and Austria agree to his proposal. The arrangements made in the Congress were that Prussia obtained Thorn and Danzig with Posen, Austria regained Galicia, and Cracow was constituted as an independent Republic under the guarantee of the Eastern Powers. The rest of the Grand Duchy of Warsaw was created as the "Congress Kingdom of Poland" and it was made over to the Tsar of Russia as the King of Poland. The Tsar granted a new constitution to the Poles, and assured them of civil liberty. But the new Diet did not accept the reforms in the proper spirit. The Polish nobility wanted their old privileges, and on account of their attitude a bitter friction arose between the Russians and the Poles. On the death of Tsar Alexander his successor Nicholas I withdrew the concessions and suspended the constitution. The Diet was not summoned for five years, and the Polish patriots began to organise secret societies.

On the outbreak of the revolution in France and Belgium in 1830 the Poles rose in rebellion. Strong sympathy was expressed for the Polish cause in France, Germany and Great Britain. But no Government was prepared to intervene. Without any aid from outside the Poles carried on their struggle for freedom for one year. But they could not stand against the Russian Army. The Polish revolt was crushed, the Poles were subjected to rigorous repression. Poland ceased to exist as a separate state. The constitution was revoked, about 80,000 Poles were sent into exile, thousands were put to death, the University of Vilna was suppressed, and the Polish language was forbidden. Every attempt was made to carry out a thorough

Russianization of the country. The Poles, however, never gave up their hope of recovering their independence. Revolts took place in 1846 and 1848, but they were easily crushed.

In 1860 the Poles presented an address to Tsar Alexander II praying for the restoration of the Polish national institutions. A Council of State consisting of Poles was created at Warsaw, and elective councils were instituted. But these concessions were nominal, the spirit of the Government still remained autocratic. The Polish spirit of revolution spread throughout the country. When 2,000 Polish youngmen were arrested as conscripts for Russian Army, but really to be sent to Siberia or Caucasus as exiles the Polish discontent burst into a flame in 1863. The Polish Dictator was killed in action. Prussia gave full support to Russia at the advice of Bismarck, Great Britain, France and Austria sent notes to the Russian Government, urging it to grant the principal demands of the Poles. But confident of the support of Prussia Russia did not pay any heed to their notes. Napoleon III proposed a Congress of the Powers, but the British Minister Palmerston did not agree. Poland was left to its own fate. The insurrection was thoroughly crushed by March, 1864. The failure of the revolution pushed Poland further back. The concessions granted were withdrawn, the Council of State was abolished, and the name of Poland was changed into that of the Government of the Vistula. Russia had to give up her old policy and threw herself into an alliance with Prussia on account of the Polish situation.

Russia failed to conciliate the Poles under her rule. She did nothing to improve the Poles economically or intellectually. But the Poles were very hopeful of their future. The Polish peasant proprietors developed their own resources, adopted cooperative methods, started credit banks and did every thing possible to help themselves. The population of Poland rapidly increased. The Poles in Galicia enjoyed some autonomy within the Austrian Empire, but the Poles under Russia suffered the worst

miseries. Since 1876 there was an elected Diet in Galicia, and the Poles enjoyed greater freedom in every respect. On the outbreak of the Great War in 1914 the Russians declared as their war aim to restore autonomy to the reunited Poland under the Romanov House, and the Central Powers as a countermove proclaimed the creation of a Polish Kingdom in 1916. Accordingly a Polish Provisional Council of State was formed that year, and a Council of Regency established in 1917. The defeat of the Central Powers led the people to declare a Polish Republic under the leadership of General Pilsudski. The independence of the country was recognised by the Treaty of Versailles, but the new constitution could not be adopted till March 1921. Poland has once again become an independent State after long struggles

SHORT NOTES.

Q. 79. Write short notes on three of the following :—

(a) **The Reform Bill of 1832**

(b) **The Greek Revolt of 1828.**

(c) **Kossuth.**

(d) **The Hague Convention.** (*P. U. 1930*)

(a) **Reform Bill of 1832.**

The system of representation in Parliament was antiquated, on account of the growth of new industrial areas a number of new cities and towns had come into existence but they had no right to send their representatives, whereas a large number of old rotten and pocket boroughs still retained their rights. Besides the qualifications of voters were also very high. People clamoured for reforms, but no definite step was taken in the direction till 1830. In March, 1831, in the Liberal Ministry of the Earl of Grey a Bill was introduced in the House of Commons by Lord John Russell. There was a strong opposition from the Tory

Party, and when the ministry was defeated on an amendment in the second reading Parliament was dissolved. In the General Elections the Liberals were returned with a heavy majority. On June 24, 1831, the Second Reform Bill was introduced. It was passed in the House of Commons by a majority of 106 (September 22, 1831) but as soon as it reached the Lords it was thrown out (October 8, 1831). On the defeat of the measure in the Lords great riots took place in the country. Parliament was prorogued and in December Russell introduced the Third Reform Bill. It was carried in the Commons by a majority of 116 (March 23, 1832). The opposition of the Lords was still very strong. Lord Grey then asked the King to create sufficient number of new Peers who would support the Bill. The King at first did not agree, and then Grey resigned. Wellington tried to form a ministry but failed. So the King had to yield, recalled Grey, and gave him permission to create such a number of Peers as would be necessary to ensure the passing of the Reform Bill. This was enough to bring the Lords to their senses, the dissentient Peers left the House at the last stage, and the Bill was passed by a majority (June 4, 1832).

The main provisions of the Bill were. —

(1) 56 rotten Boroughs with a population of less than 2,000 were disfranchised.

(2) 32 Boroughs with population of less than 4,000 lost one seat each

(3) 143 seats thus obtained were redistributed.

(4) The franchise rules were also revised. Borough franchise was arranged to include occupiers of houses worth £10 a year, the county franchise included freeholders, copyholders, and leaseholder of property worth £10 a year, and occupiers worth £50 yearly rent.

The Reform Bill did not go very far. It enfranchised the middle class and the better class artisans, and removed certain anomalies. The ratio of voters to the population

had tremendous effect upon his countrymen. He was arrested on a charge of high treason in 1837, and sentenced to imprisonment for some years. On his release he started a paper called "*Pesti Hírlap*" (Gazette of Pesth) to advocate greater freedom for his country (1841). As an ardent democrat he preached the abolition of all feudal distinctions. He had as his coadjutor another patriot named Deak. Both of them were trying to carry out the reforms on constitutional lines. He was elected to the Diet as member for Budapesth in 1847, and then he was at once accepted as the leader of the extreme reformers. On receiving the news of the February Revolution in France and of the fall of Louis Philippe Kossuth proposed to send an address to the Emperor demanding a responsible ministry, and the "fraternization of the Austrian peoples" under the leadership of a liberated Hungary. His speech on March 3, 1848, prepared the Hungarians for an immediate action. He compared the Austrian Government to a charnel-house from which suffocating vapours and pestilential winds issued and deadened the national spirit. This speech was widely circulated and it created a sensation throughout the Empire. Vienna was up in arms ten days later, and Metternich fled from the continent in dismay. The Hungarian Diet passed a number of reform measures known as the March Laws, which the nationalist party had been urging so long. A deputation including Kossuth waited upon the Emperor, who could not reject any of their demands, (March 31), and within a short time a Constituent Assembly met and drafted a new constitution for Hungary. But these reforms were not loyally supported by the Austrian Government. Jellacic, the Governor of Croatia, was an opponent of the Magyar movement. He incited the Croats and Serbs against the Magyars. The Hungarian Diet protested against his action and he was recalled for a time, but he was soon reinstated and then he marched with an army of Croats and Serbs (September 17). The expedition proved a failure and the Austrian Government declared the Hungarian Diet dissolved (October 3). This led to another revolution. A rising took

place in Vienna in sympathy with Hungary. Count Lemberg, the Commander-in-Chief of Hungary was, murdered, and Jellacic was appointed Dictator. The Emperor Ferdinand who could not deal with the situation abdicated in favour of his nephew Francis Joseph. The Hungarians refused to accept the new Emperor, and a severe conflict thus arose. Kossuth was the leader of the separatist party, and the Magyar army under the command of Georgei won some brilliant victories. In April, 1849, the Hungarians cut off their connection with the Hapsburg family, and declared the establishment of the Hungarian Republic. Kossuth was placed at the head of the Civil administration as President. With the help of Russia the Hungarians were defeated, Georgei surrendered on August 13, after a disastrous defeat at Vilagos, Kossuth fled to Turkey, and then to England and America. He died in Italy in 1894.

(d) **The Hague Convention.**

At the invitation of Tsar Nicholas II an International Conference met at the Hague in 1899 which lasted from May 18 to July 19. It was attended by representatives of 26 Governments. The main object of the Conference was to consider the problem of lightening the burden of armaments which weighed on all Europe and to find some means of removing the menace of war. Opinions on disarmament were conflicting. None of the great Powers were willing to run any risks by reducing their military strength. They only passed a resolution declaring that "a limitation of the military expenses which now burden the world is greatly to be desired in the interests of material and moral well-being of mankind" and a desire was expressed that the Governments should take up this subject for examination. The second thing that the Conference did was to set up a Permanent Court of Arbitration to settle international disputes. Recourse to this court is optional, but a machinery was at hand, if any body wanted it. Some rules or conventions were laid down regarding the procedure of the court.

The Second Conference met in 1907. It was attended by representatives of 44 States. This Conference adopted a number of conventions regulating the actual conduct of war in more humane fashion, and in defining certain aspects of international law with greater precision than heretofore. But no progress was made with regard to compulsory arbitration or disarmament and limitation of armaments.

Q. 80 Write short notes on five of the following :—

- (a) Louis Blanc.
- (b) The Alabama Incident.
- (c) The Dreyfus case
- (d) Chartism
- (e) Metternich "System."
- (f) The Schleswig-Holstein Question.

(P U. 1931).

(a) Louis Blanc

Louis Blanc was the chief exponent of socialism in France. He was a voluminous writer on political and economic subjects. He tried to convince the labourers of France of the evils of the prevailing economic conditions. He impressed the necessity of providing workmen with money and forming a cooperative workshop. "We will work and live or we will fight and die" was the watchword of his followers. He believed that when the State would be organised as a democratic republic, then it would be possible to create national or social workshops which would be controlled by the working men. This doctrine appealed to the labourers, and he succeeded in organising a strong party. His book *L'Organisation du travail* (The Organisation of Labour) published in 1839 marked an important phase in the evolution of French socialism. It supplied the real driving power for the Revolution of 1848. Louis Blanc's party pressed for a democratic and

socialistic Republic with the red flag. They had established themselves at the Hotel de Ville. They were joined there by the moderate Republicans, and reconciled when three of them were included in the Provisional Government. Louis Blanc's Scheme of National Workshops was accepted, but the department was put under a minister not in sympathy with the idea. So the experiment failed. Louis Blanc was put in charge of a Labour Commission at the Luxembourg. He tried to improve the condition of labour by reducing the hours of work, fixing a minimum wage, abolishing piece works, and sub-contracting. But these proposals were not kindly received by the Government. He gave, however, a push to the co-operative movement. In May, 1848, the National Assembly was elected according to the new constitution, the Assembly elected an Executive Committee for carrying on the work of Government. Louis Blanc was not elected to this Committee nor was he appointed a minister. The labourers got furious, rushed to the Chamber and installed a new Provisional Government at the Hotel de Ville with Louis Blanc at its head. But the attempt failed, the insurrectionary leaders were arrested, and the mob dispersed. Louis Blanc went into exile, and from there began to criticise the Government.

(b) The Alabama Incident.

During the American Civil War in 1851 England and the United States were on the point of war because of the *Alabama* and other cruisers sailing from the neutral English ports and inflicting damage upon American commerce. The dispute became so acute that ultimately the matter was submitted to arbitration. The terms of settlement, between the two Governments, were embodied in the Treaty of Washington (1871), which provided a tribunal of five persons nominated by Great Britain, the United States, Italy, Switzerland, and Brazil. The tribunal awarded £32,50,000 damages to the United States. The award was resented in England, and it lowered the prestige of the Gladstone Ministry. Gladstone himself considered

the award as harsh and unjust. But he regarded the incident as an example of great moral value, because the two nations went in peace and concord before a judicial tribunal, rather than resort to the arbitrament of the sword. The two great Powers led the way for international arbitration by referring their case to a judicial tribunal which met at Geneva in 1872

(c) The Dreyfus case

Captain Dreyfus, an Alsatian Jew, and an officer in the Artillery was accused of treason for transmitting important military documents to a foreign Power. He was sentenced by the Court-martial to imprisonment for life, and banished to the Devil's Island in South America.(1895) The case. was based upon a document known as the "bordereau". In 1896 Col. Picquart who was attached to the Intelligence Department of the General Staff discovered that the "bordereau" was not the work of Dreyfus, but of another man named Major Esterhazy. The military authorities did not want to investigate the matter, they instead sent Picquart to Tunis and Algeria. In the meantime the public became interested in the matter. An attempt was made to reopen the case but the Premier Méline declared it closed in 1897. The racial feelings were inflamed, and the clerical party charged the friends of Dreyfus as Jews and anti-national. A trial of Esterhazy took place in 1898, and he was honourably acquitted. Col Picquart was then arrested and imprisoned on the accusation of Esterhazy. The author Emile Zola was also prosecuted for writing in defence of Dreyfus. When Cavaignac as Minister of War produced three documents before the Chamber of Deputies to prove the guilt of Dreyfus, Picquart wrote to him that the two documents were irrelevant and the third was a forgery. It was published in the news papers that Col. Henry had forged the third document, that he had confessed it and then committed suicide. Cavaignac resigned, and the case was then referred to the Court of Cassation. When the court was deliberating President Faure died, and he was succeeded by Emile Loubet (1899). Esterhazy who had fled to

England then confessed that he had written the "bordereau." The Court of Cassation ordered the re-trial of Dreyfus before a Court martial at Rennes. Dreyfus in his second trial did not receive justice, and he was held guilty by five to two, with "extenuating circumstances." He was condemned to ten years' imprisonment. But President Loubet granted him pardon, and the Government passed an amnesty to all those implicated in the case (1900).

In 1906 the case was submitted to the Court of Cassation for revision, and Dreyfus was held innocent. Dreyfus was restored to his rank in the Army, and Picquart was promoted. Zola had died in 1903, but his body was transferred to the Pantheon as a mark of honour. Thus closed a case over which France was agitated for a number of years, and a movement to overthrow the Republic collapsed.

(d) Chartism.

The Reform Bill of 1832 was carried through the efforts of the Liberals and Radicals, but the Bill failed to improve the lot of the working men. The Radicals demanded wider franchise but the Liberals replied that the measure of 1832 was final. The Radicals therefore started a vehement agitation for further reform. In 1838 they drew up a monster petition known as "the People's Charter". Since then these people are called the Chartists, and their movement is known as Chartism or Chartist movement. Their demands were set forth under five heads —

1. Manhood suffrage—every adult man should be given the right to vote
2. Vote by ballot—so that every voter could be free from intimidation.
3. Abolition of the property qualification for the membership of Parliament.
4. Payment of salaries to members of Parliament so that poor men might be elected if the voters wished

5 Annual Parliament—So that representatives may remain in intimate contact with the people

One petition was submitted in 1839, and it was summarily rejected, the second in 1842 with the same fate. On the occasion of the February Revolution in France in 1848 the Chartists made elaborate arrangements for a monster petition and a people's Parliament. Government took strong precautions and the movement collapsed. The petition was summarily rejected. Although the Chartist movement failed, most of its programme have been carried out. Franchise has been extended not only to adult men but to women, members of the Commons are being paid salaries, the property qualification of members has been abolished, and vote by ballot has been introduced. The life of Parliament has also been reduced from seven to five years.

(c) Metternich's System

Metternich guided the policy of the Central Powers from 1815 to 1848. He believed that the one necessity in Germany was to crush Liberalism, Constitutionalism and Parliamentarism. His policy in Austria was thoroughly reactionary, and Prussia followed his lead. He also coerced the rulers of some States in Germany, he tried to make constitutional experiments to give up their plans. By every possible means he prevented the growth of national spirit, and did his best to keep the country in stagnation by preventing the entry of liberal thoughts from abroad. He followed strictly the injunction of the Emperor: "Govern and change nothing." Metternich enunciated his own policy in the words: "Neither to innovate nor to go back, but to keep things as they are". This policy he believed would lead to peace which the war-weary Europe was so anxious to taste. Any attempt at constitutional reforms would be resisted by the forcible intervention of the Powers. By this method he made Austria the great conservative barrier to all the progressive movements in Europe. "Metternich System" as it

is called worked very vigorously in Europe so long as there was the feeling of exhaustion after the war. In 1830 France and Belgium abandoned this policy, but it continued in the Central and Eastern Europe till 1848. The forces of liberalism and nationalism overthrew the system of international repression.

(f) **The Schleswig-Holstein Question.**

The two duchies of Schleswig and Holstein belonged to the King of Denmark by personal right. Holstein was included in the German Confederation but not Schleswig. It was the policy of the Eider-Dane party to absorb these duchies into Denmark and to abolish their separate government. In 1864 Denmark abolished the Duchies and for this Austria and Prussia declared war against her. In the war Denmark was defeated and Schleswig and Holstein were surrendered to Austria and Prussia. The problem of the future government of the duchies gave rise to some trouble. The people of the duchies were in favour of the Duke of Augustenburg, and his claims were supported by Austria, the German states, and the King of Prussia. But Bismarck wanted to make the question the means of destroying the existing federal system in Germany, and of expelling Austria from Germany. He first placed the duchies under the joint control of Austria and Prussia, then by the Convention of Gastein placed Holstein in charge of Austria and Schleswig in charge of Prussia. Later on he quarrelled with Austria for inciting the people of Schleswig to rise against Prussia. This brought about the Seven Weeks' War. The Treaty of Prague settled the question by which the duchies went to Prussia, and Austria went out of Germany.

Q. 81. State what you know about any two of the following :—

Hetaireia philike; Kultur Kampf; Napoleonic idea; Zollverein, Young Ireland. (P. U. 1295).

Hetaireia Philike

It was a secret society founded by Greek merchants at

Odessa. It had as its objects the deliverance of the Hellenic race, the overthrow of the Turks, the recovery of Constantinople and the revival of the orthodox empire of the East. By 1820 it enrolled about 200,000 members. A rising took place in Moldavia under the leadership of Prince Alexander Hyspanti (February 7, 1821). But the revolt was soon crushed. The Greeks were an old people, they had the tradition of an ancient civilization. The Turks could not destroy their national feelings. In spite of remaining under foreign rule for centuries the Greeks still cherished the hope of their revival. The persistence of the Greek language, the memories of Hellenic culture, and the devoted labour of the priests maintained the national feeling. There were a large number of Greeks scattered abroad, who coming in contact with other peoples developed a new sense of national self-respect. A movement for Hellenic literary revival started in Paris, and the Hetaireia Philike (Association of Friends) was the most famous organisation for Greek revival. It gave coherence and unity to the nationalist movement among the Greeks. The Greek War of Independence was inspired by the idealism of this society.

Kultur Kampf

The problem of "Church and State" took a serious turn in the German Empire, when Bismarck found that the Catholics were opposed to the idea of unity, as the King of Prussia did not belong to the Catholic Church. The Catholics did not also subscribe to the view of Bismarck that in a State the authority of the Civil Government should be supreme. They on the other hand, upheld the doctrine of the Infallibility of the Pope's orders enunciated in the recent Œcumenical Council (1870) and wanted that this dogma should be taught in the Universities and Schools. They also supported the Pope's *Syllabus of Modern Errors* issued in 1864 which denied

freedom to other creeds and asserted the independence of the Church from the State. The Old Catholics led by Dr. Dollinger did not recognise these claims of the Pope. The Papal party excommunicated the Old Catholics, removed them from Catholic Schools and Ecclesiastical offices, and demanded that they should be dismissed from the State Universities and public schools. The Government of Prussia and of other States did not comply with their wishes, and this led to a severe conflict between the Church and the State. The movement to make the state supreme and to maintain civilisation against the forces of religion is called the *Kultur Kampf*. The Government of Prussia passed a number of Laws against the Catholics known as the May Laws. Between 1872 and 1876 the Jesuits were expelled, civil marriage was made compulsory, priests were forbidden to interfere in political matters the Catholic Bureau in the Ministry of Education was abolished, and the inspection of schools was withdrawn from the clergy and placed in the hands of State Inspectors, all ecclesiastical seminaries were placed under State control, and sufficient protection was granted to those who would not submit to the disciplinary action of the Church for breaking Church Laws. The Pope declared these measures illegal and ordered the clergy to disregard them. Bismarck thought that he would win his point by firmness, and he remarked in the language of Henry IV, "We will not go to Canossa either in the flesh or in the spirit". The clerical party, however, by their obstinacy made Bismarck yield. The Catholic party gradually gained strength in the Reichstag, and the embarrassment of the Government was increased by the socialist movement. On the death of Pope Pius IX in 1878 Bismarck negotiated compromise with the new Pope Leo XIII. The repressive laws were repealed one after another, but the laws regarding registration of marriages, births and deaths and inspection of Schools remained in force.

Napoleonic Idea

The people of France cherished the memory of Napoleon Bonaparte with pride. His name was associated with the glories of France. During the Orleanist monarchy an attempt was made to commemorate the name of Napoleon in various forms. The Napoleonic legends were revived through art and literature, and his exploits and services were brought to the notice of the people. His remains were brought to St. Helena and laid beneath the dome of the Invalides in 1840. He was honoured as one of the greatest monarchs of France. This revived interest in Napoleon encouraged his nephew Louis Napoleon to bid for the throne. Once he tried to come to the throne with the help of the soldiers in the fortress of Strasbourg, but nobody responded to his appeal and he was made a prisoner. He however managed to escape, and when the remains of Napoleon were brought from St. Helena he landed near Boulogne with sixty companions (August 6, 1869). He was arrested and in defence he said: "I represent before you a principle, a cause, a defeat. The principle is the Sovereignty of the People, the cause is that of the Empire, the defeat is Waterloo." He was sentenced to imprisonment for life, but he managed to escape six years later. After the revolution of 1848 he returned to France, got himself elected to the Assembly and became the President of the Republic and then assumed the title of Emperor with the help of the Napoleonic legends. People wanted a Napoleon back to power, because Napoleon stood before them as the symbol of peace and prosperity at home and glory abroad.

Zollverein

There were innumerable barriers in the way of commerce in Germany. Trade was obstructed by a large number of tariff systems. Districts, cities and provinces were separated from one another. This encouraged smuggling. Prussia adopted a new policy in 1818. At

the instance of Maassen the internal customs were abolished, free trade was introduced throughout Prussia, duties upon raw materials were removed and a uniform duty of 10 per cent was imposed upon manufactured articles, and 10 per cent on colonial produce. This improved the financial condition of the country. Success of the reforms introduced in Prussia led to the formation of a Union with other countries. The first to join this Union was Schwarzburg-Sonderhausen (1819). Six more States joined in 1822 and by 1834 there were seventeen States forming the Zollverein or Customs Union. The member States allowed goods to pass freely from one state to another, and they maintained a common tariff frontier against outsiders. The revenues were shared *pro rata* according to population. The Southern States led by Bavaria and Wurtemberg at first formed a customs union of their own (1828) and so also did the Central States, only a few states remained outside. The method of joining the Union was to enter into a treaty with Prussia. The benefits derived were so great that the treaties were renewed till 1853. The Prussian leadership in the Customs Union was challenged by Austria and other States, but she managed to retain it against all opposition. It had been truly said that the General feeling in Germany towards the Zollverein was that it was the first step towards the Germanization of the people. The value of this Union was so much appreciated that when the Southern States kept out of the North German Confederation they retained their connection with the Zollverein. With the formation of the German Empire commerce has become a central subject.

Young Ireland

The Irish people felt greatly humiliated when they were denied equal rights with the English. Although the Catholic Emancipation Act of 1829 allowed Catholics to sit in the House of Commons, the franchise qualification was increased to ten pounds. This led to a movement for separation under the leadership of O'Connell. But their

movement failed on account of the attitude of the English people. The young followers of O'Connell formed a society called "Young Ireland" with the object of gaining independence for Ireland, and establishing a republic there. They rose in revolt in 1848, but were easily crushed. For many years after this Irish politics remained quiescent.

Maps

Q. 82. Give with the aid of a map, the various stages by which the unification of Germany or unity of Italy, was attained. (P. U. 1920).

Q. 83. Explain with the aid of a map, the various stages by which the union of Italy has been achieved.

Q. 84. Note, with the aid of a map, the political changes in the Balkan peninsula after 1815. (P. U. 1917).

Q. 85. Draw a map of Germany, showing the growth of Prussia in the nineteenth century. (P. U. 1916).

Q. 86. Draw a map of the Balkan Peninsula showing the changes effected by the Treaty of Berlin. (P. U. 1925).

Madan Lal Kishore